# The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXV, No. 5 November, 1946

CONTENTS

The Priesthood . . . *Francis Cardinal Spellman* 321

Paratrooper Padre. Part I . . *Francis Sampson* 324

How Saints Are Canonized . *Thomas A. Halley, S.J.* 337

Catholic Action Makes Progress . *Edward J. Mattimoe* 351

Mass Without a Server . . . *Walter W. Curtis* 364

The Requisites for an Infallible Pontifical Definition According to the Commission of Pope Pius IX *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 376

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mass or Stipend? . . . . . 385

Cumulative Investiture in the Scapulars . . . . 385

The Problem of Mixed Marriages . . . . . 386

*Contents Continued on Next Page*

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1946, by The Catholic University of America Press

*Contents Continued from Previous Page*

Separation Because of Adultery . . . . . 388

A Problem of Marital Obligations . . . . . 389

BOOK REVIEWS

A Padre Views South America, *by Peter Masten Dunne, S.J.* 390

Marriage and the Family, *by Edgar Schmiedler, O.S.B.* . 393

The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, *by R. V. G. Tasker* 394

Mariology, *by M. J. Scheeben* . . . . . 395

The Life of Father Faber, *by James F. Cassidy* . . . 396

No Dreamers Weak, *by Michael de la Bedoyere* . . . 397

A Companion to the Old Testament, *by John E. Steinmueller* 398

BOOK NOTES . . . . . 400

***Your Cumulative Canonical Case Book***

**THE JURIST**

**A QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE SCHOOL OF CANON LAW OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA**

***The More You Know, The More You Know Its Value***

***25 Cases Solved in Each Issue***

**THE JURIST treasures highly the following appreciation of its contribution to the science of law offered by one who is himself an outstanding canonist:**

"Believe me most sincerely when I say that you have a right to be most proud of THE JURIST. I meet many priests in the New York and Brooklyn area, and I notice how highly they speak of each issue. I am enamored of your choice selection of court decisions that touch on our fields in Church life. Many priests of my acquaintance look forward with interest to that section of the magazine, and I confess that it is my favorite part of each issue, too."

***Annual Subscription Stipend $3.00***

## THE PRIESTHOOD

When Mother Church makes regulations concerning sacred vessels such as chalices and ciboria, she prescribes that at least the inner surfaces which are to come in immediate contact with the Most Blessed Sacrament, must be of gold. She wants only the royal metal traditionally accepted as earth's most precious to be used in this material proximity to the Holy Eucharist.

Surely, therefore, she must ask the same of living persons who by reason of their sacerdotal vocation are destined for a special closeness and sacramental oneness with Christ. The true priest must and will ever strive to keep his soul like untarnished gold—a fitting habitation for Christ, loving and loved. Complete conformity to God's holy will is the golden standard of the priesthood, the only standard acceptable to our Holy Mother Church and Christ, her Divine founder and leader. The soul of the priest must be lined with the untarnished gold of personal holiness if worthily he is to live his life and meritoriously exercise his high office.

There is nothing new in this statement for it is but the formula of the fundamentals of the priestly vocation which we must follow if our priestly lives are to fructify in grace. It is true that we must equip ourselves with knowledge and use all proper means to make ourselves representative ministers of Christ, but the essential and adequate virtue is to anchor our hearts, our wills and our minds—our whole souls—in personal love for Jesus. This is the following of Christ. This is holiness. God is love and His commandment is love, first for Himself and then for His image as found in man. To love God is to imitate God, to live as God lives—God's life as revealed to man in Jesus, our Lord and Redeemer.

Catholic life is duplex—to let God live in us and to let ourselves live in God. This is the Divine command even for the humblest members of the mystical body of Christ. Therefore, how much more seriously and strictly does this obligation apply to priests who are, as it were, the inner lining of Christ's mystical chalice. We, who are the heart and the lips, the very mind and soul of Christ, should be suffused with love of God—should be holy with the holiness of His Spirit—should be truly golden living

chalices for the sacrifice that Christ through us, and through those who will take our places, will continue until time shall be no more.

This consideration is of such importance that we should ponder it now when men say that civilization is at the crossroads. Humankind is appalled by the powers and the dangers of the forces of nature that have been discovered and that may be unleashed, but the true danger to man lies in man's forgetfulness of the remedy for the primal fissuring of man's soul through original sin, the wound which brought chaos into a universe of order and harmony, brought death to life, and planted hatred where love had flowered unchallenged.

As priest-followers of Christ, we must be aware that it is not only atomic energy that must be controlled. Man must conquer and control himself. Our weapons, prayer and sacrifice, are as ancient as Christ and His Church—our prayers and our sacrifices merged and made one with the prayer and sacrifice of Christ; putting off of the old man and the putting on of the God-Man, Christ Jesus; learning to die to self that Christ alone may live in us and that through us Christ may advance His Heavenly Father's glory among the sons of men.

The world needs a re-birth in grace, it needs the light of a sunrise in faith, and we, priests of today and priests of tomorrow, must be the ministers of that re-birth, must be that sunrise. Christ never has and never will fail His Church, but Christ's priests have at times failed Christ and failed Him grievously, and in failing Christ a priest fails not Christ alone, nor his own soul alone, but he fails all mankind. No priest goes to heaven or to hell alone. He comes from among men and returns to them. He brings them either good or evil, grace or vanity, health of soul or misery of spirit, heaven or hell, God or the spirit of the world.

Let us strive to be to our fellowman that which God ordained us to be, to bring to the world Christ Who is its true sunshine, God's grace which is salvation. We, my dear Fathers, must, before all else, aspire perseveringly to personal sanctity. Nothing else gives us real efficiency in His service. Nothing else will give us final satisfaction. Nothing else will make us acceptable to the Divine Master Who now gives Himself to us but Who some day will require our souls and the souls which He has committed to our shepherding. We must not, therefore, neglect the upbuilding,

the intensifying, the deepening of our interior life, for without this, the most brilliant mental gifts will be exchanged for the passing applause of men the Eve's apple of some pleasure or Judas' thirty pieces of silver.

Let us not fail Christ Who has so honored us. Let us be worthy of His priesthood, worthy as human frailty permits. That we may not fail Him, let us daily turn our thoughts to the Immaculate Mother of God, Queen and Mother of all Saints, Mother of God's High Priest and the Mother of all priests, and ask of her that, as she molded in her bosom the Incarnate Word of God, so unto the fulness of God's design and the consummation of our earthly pilgrimage she, God's august and virgin Mother, will deign to mold us faithful followers of Christ, worthy priests and zealous shepherds of souls.

✠ Francis Cardinal Spellman.

---

### Fifty Years Ago

In the November, 1896, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article is entitled "Leo XIII and the Anglican Communion," and presents the Latin text, with an English translation, of the famous Bull *Apostolicae curae,* in which Pope Leo XIII, on Sept. 13, 1896, definitively pronounced Anglican Orders invalid, because of defect of form and of intention. (It is sad to realize that, despite the careful investigation of the whole question by a competent committee and the definitive nature of the Pope's decision, there are still Anglicans who believe that at some future day the Holy See may regard Anglican Orders as at least probably valid). . . . An anonymous article on "The Parish Priest as a Financier" contains some practical suggestions in regard to raising and expending money by a pastor without the necessity of constantly urging his people to contribute. . . . The *Analecta* section prints the Apostolic letter of Aug. 18, 1896, appointing Archbishop Martinelli Apostolic Delegate to the United States, to succeed Archbishop Satolli, who had occupied that post for three years. . . . A correspondent who believes that the word *seminarist* should be used in preference to *seminarian* is informed that the latter form is quite in harmony with our custom of designating origin of place by the termination *ian,* even though the Latin form is *seminarista.* . . . In a review of Dr. Stang's *Pastoral Theology* it is stated that this is the first work of its kind in English, apart from some translations from the German or French.

F. J. C.

# PARATROOPER PADRE

[Editor's Note: *Fr. Francis Sampson of the Diocese of Des Moines, Chaplain with the famed 101st Airborne Division, saw action during the invasions of Normandy and Holland and was captured at Bastogne during the Battle of the Bulge. He spent the last six months of the war in a German prison camp. He holds the Distinguished Service Cross, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, Presidential Unit Citation with Cluster, and several Dutch, French, and Belgian decorations, including the Belgian Croix de guerre. During his period of service, he kept a record of his experiences in letters to members of his family. Believing that his was an extremely interesting story,* The American Ecclesiastical Review *persuaded Chaplain Sampson, after his return to this country, to make the letters available to its readers. The series of articles which begins in this issue is made up of excerpts from those letters. Fr. Sampson was separated from the service on Oct. 1, 1945. He has since rejoined the armed forces and is now stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.*]

## PART I: THE NORMANDY INVASION

A personal narration of the bit of the war against Germany which I saw must necessarily be autobiographical, and so might seem a bit egotistical, because of the predominant use of the first person. If you will remember that no pair of knees ever shook more, nor any heart ever beat faster in time of danger than my own; and if you will keep in mind that it was not only impossible . . . it was unthinkable, to allow fear to control your actions in the presence of those fine boys who fought and died so bravely . . . if you remember these things you will understand how any priest does what he must do almost automatically, instinctively.

These pages may give you the false impression that combat is continuous and always exciting. As a matter of fact it is, for the most part, monotonous; and the greatest part of every soldier's job mere routine. I have written down only the interesting incidents, and not bothered about our plan or strategy, what we accomplished or failed to accomplish. There were many days when nothing of interest or import happened so far as the Regiment was concerned. These pages give you only the high lights of my own limited view and experience in the war against Germany.

We knew about ten days before the invasion that this would be it. We were sent to an airport during this period and no one allowed to leave the grounds. Part of our outfit, however, was a hundred miles away at a different airport and the Chaplains were permitted to fly back and forth so that we could see all of our men before "D" Day and "H" Hour. All the Catholic men went to Confession and Communion before we left.

As we marched to the planes I waited as the men went by and shook each man's hand and gave him a sincere "God bless you!" After boarding the planes I led our plane load in a short prayer. We took off on the second and once the formations had formed we went at top speed. The boys were rather quiet; some tried to sleep, others smoked steadily, and a few tried to be nonchalant by singing some modern songs. I was wondering if we would meet any fighter planes over the channel . . . it was a cold night and the Channel water is always like ice . . . I didn't relish an emergency jump. We got across without mishap and only one enemy plane came near us. But, as soon as we were over land the ack ack was terrific. The plane was hit many times and one boy had a bullet go right through his leg. As we stood up and hooked up, the plane was rocking badly in a strong wind. The green light came on and the jump master pushed our equipment bundle out and we went out as fast as we could, my assistant right behind me. Our jump was a surprise all right . . . for us! The Germans were waiting for us and they sent such a barrage of bullets at us that it will always remain a mystery to me how any of us lived. The tracer bullets alone made it look like the Fourth of July. I collapsed part of my chute to come down faster. From there on my guardian angel took over.

I lit in the middle of a stream over my head. I grabbed my knife and cut my bags from me (my Mass kit, *etc.*) but could scarcely move to free myself. The canopy of my chute stayed open and the strong wind blew me down the stream about 100 yards and into shallow water. I lay there a few minutes exhausted and as securely pinned down by equipment as if I had been in a straitjacket. None of our men were near, and it took about twenty minutes to get out of my chute (it seemed a year, with German machine gun and mortar fire sweeping the area). I crawled back to the edge of the stream near the spot where I landed, and started diving for my Mass equipment. By pure luck I recovered

it after the fifth or sixth dive. The whole area was swamp, and as I started getting my bearings I looked for the lights to assemble on. I learned later that they were shot out as soon as they were turned on and the men in charge mostly killed or wounded. Very luckily I spotted my assistant not very far away, still struggling to get out of his chute. We got together and made for the nearest hedgerow that would offer cover. We no sooner got there than a plane on fire came straight at us. The plane crashed about eighty yards in front of us and threw flaming pieces over our heads. We saw two more planes go down not far away. Neither of us had a weapon so we welcomed two of our men who came crawling along the hedgerow.

Our little group got together and started toward the place we judged our troops might assemble. We moved slowly under concealment of hedgerows, and welcomed the sight of half a dozen paratroopers running down the road ditch. They were not of our Regiment but told us where we might find the 501st or a part of it. We went in the direction they pointed until we came under heavy enemy rifle fire and I approached a nearby farmhouse. I walked in and found the house full of wounded paratroopers . . . about twenty-five of them. It was just a three room house and the French farmer, his wife and child were there. Chaplain McGee—a splendid Protestant Chaplain—was giving first aid as best he could. He had run out of bandages and since I, my assistant, and the Medic were well supplied he was very happy to see us. We all worked with the men for the better part of the day. A boy came in wounded telling us of his buddy who was shot in the back in the tall weeds about 100 yards from the house. Chaplain McGee and I decided to try and find him. Just as we stepped out of the house (front door) a German mortar hit the back door and killed the French woman and the little girl. The poor farmer nearly went out of his head.

About six p. m., some of the patients getting worse, I decided to try to find a doctor, so I went looking for our Regimental Aid Station. I left my assistant with Chaplain McGee. After going about a mile I found a patrol of our men and they told me where to go. Since the area was under fire I avoided the road and went by way of the swamp. The deep swamp was filthy and cold but afforded good cover. I finally reached the Regimental Aid. There was quite a fight going on there. The enemy had dug in

well on the high ground about 300 yards from us, and were picking off some of our men.

The enemy was gaining strength and we were losing, so about 8:30 the Officer in Command decided to withdraw to safer ground a couple of miles away. The wounded that could walk would go with them . . . the others must be left behind. The Medical Aid men drew straws to see which one remained with the wounded. A boy named Fisher drew the short straw. I told the Regimental Surgeon that I was staying with the wounded. The Germans had perpetrated so many atrocities that I thought I might be able to keep the men from getting panicky and possibly keep the Germans from adding another crime to their list. As soon as the last of our forces had left I made a white flag from a sheet and hung it out the door. One boy had just had a hand grenade go off in his pocket and the doctor, before he left, told me that only a miracle could save the boy's life. I gave the lad two blood plasma units at once and spent all night running between the serously wounded patients and the white flag. Every fifteen minutes I would go out and wave the white flag, because I was afraid the Germans, suspecting a trap, would fire hand grenades and mortars into the house before approaching it.

All night long this went on. The boy with the grenade wound died about four a. m. in my arms . . . a peaceful and holy death clutching the Crucifix which I had taken down from the wall. All the boys joined in prayers for him. The Medic and myself changed all the bandages of the men, and as I was cooking some hot chocolate I looked out and saw the Germans set up a machine-gun in the front yard. I grabbed the white flag and went out. A German jumped at me and stuck a gun in my stomach.

Well, a couple of paratroopers (German) marched me up the road about a quarter of a mile. One of them pushed me against a hedgerow and the two stepped back about ten feet and pulled back the bolts of their weapons. I said a quick Act of Contrition. Just then there were some shots fired just a few feet over our heads. It was a German noncom firing to attract the attention of the men I was with. He came running down the road and stopped when he reached us. He was a fine looking tough soldier about twenty-five. He spoke to my two captors and told me in broken English to come with him. I told him I was a Catholic priest and showed him my credentials. And to my real amaze-

ment he snapped to attention, saluted, made a slight bow, and showed me a medal pinned inside his uniform. (A great many German soldiers wear medals, badges, and carry prayer books.) He took me a little farther down the road to a German officer, who in turn called an Intelligence man. I explained that I was a Chaplain, knew nothing of military value and requested to be allowed to stay with my wounded men. The officer permitted this and my noncom friend took me back. The German paratroopers had ransacked the house of the little food we had, and picked up all the hand grenades that our men had left. The noncom, in a very friendly way, told me to stay with my "comrades" and that a German doctor would come in a day or so. I had to show him the wounds of all the men and practically every square inch of the house, *i.e.*, drawers, cupboards, attic, *etc.* Then he left. But the paratroopers (German) dug in about the grounds and in the adjoining fields.

The wounded men had been frightened almost to death. One German had put a gun to one of the boys' head and pulled back the bolt; all the others turned their heads away. Another had shot the ceiling full of holes. The men were weak from fear and I told them that I had been too, but they were all quite calm. I spent the next few hours changing bandages and giving plasma, and fixed a bit of chocolate and what few rations we could scare up. The Germans were constantly running around outside the house, and apparently were planning to stay permanently.

The men gradually fell asleep and about ten p. m. I did so too. Just about midnight heavy shells began to fall and were landing on every side of us. One of the boys said it must be our own artillery trying to root the Germans out of this strategic high ground. The whole house bounced and shook for four hours. I put three of the men under the beds; the plaster was dropping all over the place, and the window glass had sprayed all over the room. Fourteen of the men were in one room, most of them very seriously wounded. Two men with sprained ankles were in the kitchen, and a Medic was in the barn holding down a boy who had gone out of his head, and who was trying to run out to the Germans. About 2:30 a. m. three shells made a direct hit on the house all at once. Half of the house completely collapsed on the two boys in the kitchen. I heard one of them call out "Father Sampson," and just as I got to the door the rest of the ceiling

came down on the boy. I held his head in my arm and cleared away debris till I could touch his back. I felt his heart pump very hard for about one minute and then stop. I dug in the debris until I could touch the other boy. He was crushed beyond help and was dead. The roof of the kitchen and the entire wall was blown out (and the wall was almost two feet of stone thick). I had one of the boys lead the others in saying the "Our Father" over and over and that seemed to calm them. A flashlight had been blown out of the house and somehow turned on. It flooded the remainder of the house in light and was sure to draw fire both from our artillery and from the enemy, so I went out to turn it off. Just as I stepped out a German soldier brushed past me running for all he was worth, and as I reached to turn out the flashlight I saw another German in the creek about five feet away. He moved a bit, and when I lifted him up he died. I turned around to go back into the house and saw a German kneeling on one knee and leaning against the house. He had a machine gun across one knee pointing straight at me. I said another quick Act of Contrition and ran into the house. The next morning the German was still there, in the same position. He was dead.

How we ever survived that night I shall never know, except that the calm fervent prayers of those wounded boys didn't leave God any choice in the matter but to answer them. After the artillery was through our infantry (501st) came up to close in. The house was riddled with rifle and machine gun fire. A tracer bullet ricocheted off the ceiling, grazed my leg and set my pants on fire. I saw an American lieutenant sneaking upon our building with hand grenades. I ran out and stopped him, yelling for all I was worth. He said that he thought there were Germans in there. The Germans who were not killed were captured. Ours was the only room left standing in the entire village.

In a great hurry, we evacuated the wounded men to the Division Hospital. The hospital was set up in an enormous French chateau. There was a wall around the chateau and the other buildings that made it look like a fortress. There were between two and three hundred wounded lying on the lawn, and about the same number in the chateau.

The hospital Chaplain, Fr. Durren, looked completely washed out. He had had scarcely any sleep either since the hospital had set up. I told him to go to bed, and that I would take over. He

did so, but made me promise to wake him at two a. m. It was then seven p. m. Father had tagged the men he had anointed, and marked the men whose confessions he had heard. They were coming in steadily, however, wounded Americans and Germans. I had picked up enough German to ask if they were Catholic and to tell them that I was a priest. About sixty per cent of them were Catholic, and they always made the Sign of the Cross when I took out the stole. They made Acts of Contrition and received Viaticum reverently as well-instructed and good Catholics. These, I later learned, were mostly from Bavaria. Many of them were in their early teens; some had not begun to shave.

A touching incident occurred as I was going from one to another hearing confessions and anointing; and for the Protestant and Jewish boys saying a prayer with them and helping them to make an Act of Contrition. I had anointed a German boy who was horribly wounded—his abdomen had been ripped open and his intestines and other organs had bulged out and hung down. An American boy with a serious head wound lay on a stretcher about twelve feet away. The Medic had tucked a folded blanket under the head of the American, but the blanket had slipped off his litter, and he was groaning because of the painful position of his head. The German soldier crawled off his litter and along the floor on his back to the side of the American, fixed the folded blanket under his head again, and crawled back to his own litter. The German boy died within the hour.

I remained at the hospital until noon the following day, sleeping from three until six a.m. I did not wake up Fr. Durren until seven a.m., as he had been completely exhausted. Front line duty is not nearly as tiring as hospital duty, especially when the wounded keep pouring in as they did those first few days. A lieutenant of my outfit arrived with a couple of wounded boys and told me that the Regiment was assembling at a nearby town. He drove me there in his jeep. I reported in, and went to find a place to sleep, for I could scarcely move by this time. A couple of boys from our demolition section dug a deep comfortable foxhole for me and bedded it down with a parachute. Just as I was about to lie down, a German medium bomber, coming over at about twelve hundred feet, shut off his motors and dropped three small bombs. The Regimental staff came running out of the buildings at the approach of the plane, and didn't stop for permission to use any

foxholes. It gave the boys quite a laugh to see the brass taking running dives for the nearest holes. The bombs landed right in the middle of the field we were in, but the only casualties were three cows. If the whole German Luftwaffe came over, it couldn't have kept me from going to sleep. I slept twenty-four hours straight through.

Thursday, after a full day's sleep, I went to Headquarters to see how well we had accomplished our mission, and found that we had done a one hundred per cent job. We had done so well, in fact, that another mission was to be added. However, only 950 men could be accounted for out of our jumping list of 2100. A couple of hundred men later dribbled in, in small groups.

One of our men told me that the mayor of the town would like to see me. He took me to him. The mayor's twelve year old son had been killed in the fighting in the town a couple of days before. Two Germans had used the boy as a shield, each holding one of his arms as they crossed the road. American machine gun fire killed all three. The mayor was bitter only against the Germans. The local priest was in a concentration camp (for listening to a radio which he had not given up as was required by the Germans), and the mayor wanted me to hold the funeral for the boy. I held the funeral the following morning, and a large number of my own men attended. The family could not express their gratitude enough. They invited me to dinner the following Sunday.

Friday evening the Germans bombed the Division Hospital, and did a very thorough job of it with just two giant bombs, probably three thousand pounders. The bombing was probably accidental. One bomb hit the corner of the chateau, and the other about fifty yards away. Fortunately, practically all the patients had been evacuated that afternoon. The seven patients that remained were killed. Six medical aid men, one doctor, and five prisoners were also killed. Fr. Durren fortunately escaped serious injury. The bomb that landed in the field by the hospital dug a tremendous crater, forty-two feet deep and eighty-five feet across. Two boys were sleeping in a foxhole right beside it and were not injured although they were entirely covered with earth after being tossed up in the air several feet by the concussion.

Saturday morning I went to the place where the Divisional cemetery had been established. None of the bodies had been buried yet, but there were several hundred lying side by side,

waiting to be buried, each one in a parachute. I was shocked to find so many of my faithful boys among the dead. It didn't seem possible that these young men who had been so confident a week before, and whose hands I had shaken before we boarded the planes, and who had joked and wise-cracked that "no Heinie bullet has my name on it" . . . that they were in eternity now . . . O'Callahan from Indianapolis, Neumann from Minneapolis, Houlihan from Santa Monica, *etc.* . . . they seemed like younger brothers . . . all in God's merciful hands now. German prisoners were digging the graves for both the American and the German dead. I read the burial ritual for all, and remained most of the afternoon for the actual burial.

Sunday I had Mass for the Regiment in the village church, a quaint old Norman building several hundred years old. The place was jammed, and I am sure no Catholic missed Mass on that day. We all felt that we had escaped death only through God's providential care. That afternoon I had a grand dinner at the mayor's home, and he explained to me how the French underground worked. Every German collaborator in his district, he said, had been tagged and would be taken care of.

Sunday evening I attached myself to our 2nd Bn., which moved out toward Carentan to attack the German positions on the high ground just south of the city. We started the attack at dawn. We had to cross a stream and an open swamp that made our men easy targets for Jerry snipers and mortar fire. Our casualties were extreme the first hour, mostly wounded, however. I kept very busy working with the aid men hauling wounded out of the swamp. Somehow or other I felt sure that I would not be hit, and this was one of those rare occasions when I was not particularly afraid; I was too busy to think about it.

The next day German snipers and German artillery made it hot for us. Having taken the heights south of Carentan we started to dig in to hold the ground. The 88's zeroed in on us and for an hour and a half we were under the heaviest barrage the Regiment had seen so far. German tanks had flanked us and we were in danger of being cut off. I worked during this time with a litter crew going after the wounded, and the demands from all the companies for litters and help was more than we could supply—it was a terrific time. Men would come out of their fox holes when they saw me, to go to confession.

I had run into the abandoned aid station to pick up some sulfanilimide when an 88 hit the house and caved in the kitchen, showering me with plaster and debris in the next room, and I temporarily lost my sense of hearing. I was stone deaf for about forty minutes, and then my hearing gradually came back to normal.

In combat even close calls get monotonous, and one gets careless and reckless. But just when you get to thinking that you can take care of yourself in any emergency, something happens to remind you that you are still mortal. Strange thing, morale was the highest when the going was toughest. In the thick of things there seems actually to be a zest for battle that makes it as interesting as a big traditional football game. When it is over, it is a disgusting thing to realize how eager you were to play in this rotten kind of game. Only occasionally would I feel any emotions at the sight of a body, although I always stopped to say a prayer for the soldier whether American or German. Once in a while the sight of a boy I knew especially well would choke me up—his expression in death did not resemble his normal happy-go-lucky manner.

Confession and Communion are the greatest comfort to our men at the front, and non-Catholics have observed with open envy our Catholics receiving the sacraments. Many non-Catholic boys have come to confession at the front, and not infrequently I have discovered that they received Communion from me without my realizing who they were. I heard confessions and celebrated Mass under every conceivable circumstance. One Sunday the CO told me that he thought it would be safe to hold Mass in the reserve Bn. under a grove of trees. A large number gathered there, and I started to say Mass, using my jeep as an altar. Some German artillery observer must have spotted us. 88's began to fall all around us, and at the elevation a shell threw debris all over the jeep and altar. I turned around and told the men to hit their holes, which they did—but quick. I finished Mass in two minutes flat—record time.

After three weeks in combat we were told that we were going to Cherbourg to garrison the vicinity of that city for a couple of weeks. On the way up there we stopped at Sainte Mère Eglise where all those who had died in the invasion had been moved to and reburied in three tremendous cemeteries. I said two Requiem

Masses there—one for my men and one for Fr. Maternowski, O.F.M., the Chaplain for the 508th Parachute Inf. Reg., who was killed on D Day while he was helping a group of men out of a glider that was under machine gun fire. Fr. Maternowski was a great priest.

On the way to Cherbourg we passed through a town where the Free French were having a riotous time shaving the heads and stripping the women collaborators and marching them through the streets. A French priest who had spent considerable time in a German concentration camp told me that the very ones who cut the hair and ripped off the women's clothing had themselves been very friendly and helpful to the Germans. In Paris and other large French cities our forces were cheered and wined and dined by the "patriotic" populace. But our boys who had been captured by the Germans and marched through to prison camps a couple of months before had been spat upon, kicked, and hooted at by the people of these same cities.

The Regiment was stationed a couple miles from the city and just outside the walls of a tremendous convent—a mother house, school, novitiate, and hospital of some French order. About twelve of the fourteen buildings had been completely flattened by our bombers—the Germans had been using it. About fifty sisters were still there, and not one of them had been scratched by the bombing. They had been in the deep cellar of the 12th century main building that was burned to the ground . . . the eight hundred year old basement had four-foot walls that held firm. I asked the sisters for permission to use what remained of their hospital for our sick and some recently wounded. They were happy to allow us, and were as solicitous as they could be—the most wonderful group of women that I have ever known. Their convent had been burned down some twenty years before, rebuilt, and now they were stacking the still warm bricks in piles and getting ready to build again. Their magnificent chapel had been caved in on two sides, the roof now piled up on the floor, but the good sisters were clearing away the debris as best they could.

The marvelous (maybe I should say "miraculous") thing about this chapel is the life-sized crucifix hanging above the side altar.—It was not even scratched, and although I studied the altar below it and the ceiling that had crashed down I could not find any possible explanation for the crucifix escaping serious damage, for

it hung at least three feet from the wall. Splendid life-sized statues of Sts. Peter and Paul stood unharmed in niches on each side of the crucifix. I may be credulous, but to me that was a miracle of providential protection, and so the nuns looked upon it. I asked for permission to say Mass there, and the nuns were delighted. I sent a runner to assemble the Catholics of the Regiment.—Many Protestants also attended. The sisters cleared the debris from the altar, but the tabernacle was smashed, and bricks, plaster and beams under foot made it difficult to move about. I shall never forget that Mass as long as I live.

I spoke to the men something like this. "The image of the naked Galilean hanging from the cross has always inspired great love and fierce hate. Nero sought to make the cross a hateful image by putting Christians to death on it, pouring pitch upon them and lighting Rome with these flaming human crosses. Julian the Apostate said that he would make the world forget the Man on the cross, but in his final agony had to acknowledge: 'Thou has conquered, Galilean.' Henry VIII for an extra wife was willing to strip the cross of Christ's body, and some foolish people have become puritanically ashamed of the image of their salvation. Communists forbid its presence because they fear its power against their evil designs. Hitler has tried to replace the image of our Blessed Lord on the cross with a stupid swastika. Invectives, false philosophies, violence, and every diabolical scheme has been used to tear the Christ from the cross, and the crucifix from the church. But, like the bombs that were dropped on this chapel, they have only succeeded in making the cross stand out more and more in bold relief, and the image we love grows greater in our understanding, because of the vehemence of the hate it occasions in wicked men. Each of us has that sacred image stamped upon his soul. Like this chapel, we are temples of God. And no matter how the shells of temptation may assail us, no matter how we are torn by the bombs of tragedy and trial and assault from without, the image of the Crucified remains . . . if we want it to. Now, at the foot of this cross, let us renew our baptismal vows, and let us promise to shield forever His image in our hearts."

We left the convent the following day. The sisters gave literally hundreds of rosaries and medals to my men. A windfall gave me the opportunity of repaying the sisters for their kindness. Our

supply officer told me that he had dozens of every type of brush and broom, lime, piles and piles of soap, and many other such things that we had no further use for, and this gift to the sisters was received with such expressions of gratitude that I was embarrassed.

At Cherbourg we remained for about two weeks. We were stationed about three miles from the city. I held my Masses in a beautiful little French church in a village nearby. The French people were always very much impressed by the large number of American men attending Mass and especially the sacraments. Every French priest commented upon it with wonder and admiration. This particular church had been hit several times by 88 shells but was far from ruined. The pastor's home, however, was in complete ruin. I took up a collection each Sunday for him from our men. Seven thousand francs was donated one Sunday and eight thousand the following Sunday. The poor priest, with tears in his eyes, tried desperately to tell me how grateful he was . . . and that this was more than his congregation had been able to contribute in a whole year. I have never met a French priest that did not impress me as being a real spiritual man.

I never thought that I would want to see England again, but it was almost like coming home. On the boat going back I spent nearly all my time cutting the men's hair.—The rival G.I. barbers claimed it wasn't fair—they couldn't compete with my bargain of a haircut and confession both.

Now came the most difficult job of all—writing to all the parents or wives of the men we had lost in combat. I tried desperately to make each letter as personal as possible, and since in most cases I knew the men quite well, I could speak about the last time I saw them,—and bring out some kindly trait that the family would recognize. However, this was only partially successful, and most of the letters sounded very much alike.

We were not in England long before we were preparing for another mission. About this time I began to receive answers from the parents and wives of our deceased boys. They were among the greatest consolations I have received as a priest, and I only hope that they were not destroyed, for I shall always cherish them. It was marvelous to see with what courage and fortitude and faith these people accepted the terrible sacrifice that was demanded of them.

(*To be continued*)

FRANCIS SAMPSON

*Des Moines, Iowa*

## HOW SAINTS ARE CANONIZED

It is a canonization day in Rome. Pilgrims have poured into the Eternal City from all over the world. But especially are the compatriots of the new Saints-to-be here in conspicuous numbers.

All available tickets for the actual ceremony itself have long since been distributed. St. Peter's capacity of eighty thousand will likely be swelled to a bulging overflow. Only the center aisle is kept clear for the Pope to pass through with the solemn procession of Cardinals and Papal attendants.

The interior of St. Peter's is a blaze of color. Many of the windows of the basilica have been covered with purple damask. Pillars are covered with rich red hangings. Statues are garlanded with laurel. With most of the sunlight shut out by the draped windows, huge floodlights and six hundred chandeliers with their twelve thousand bulbs supply a blaze of light within St. Peter's. Huge painted banners depicting various incidents from the lives or the miracles of the Saints-to-be are hung in conspicuous places.

Promptly at nine a.m. the silver trumpets peal out. The Pope makes his processional entrance borne aloft on the *Sedia Gestatoria* or portable throne with the *flabelli* colorfully waving over his head. The irrepressible Italian love of the Holy Father bursts out with wave after wave of "Viva il Papa!" "Viva il Papa!"

All the pomp and colorful ceremony of the Church is mustered to honor the new Saints-to-be. Besides the Cardinal Princes of the Church there are the Noble Guard and scarlet-robed Sediarii, Swiss Guard and Maestri di Camera. Then come the more solemnly attired prelates of the Signatura, Penitentiaries and Consistorial Advocates.

The Pontiff is borne to his throne in the apse at the far end of St. Peter's. The Cardinals are seated on either side of the throne. The court prelates are seated at the feet of His Holiness.

The solemn moment so long awaited has at length arrived. One of the Consistorial Advocates, speaking in the name of the Cardinal Procurator of the Canonization, advances to the papal throne and addresses the Holy Father: "Most Holy Father, the most Reverend Cardinal here present earnestly (*instanter*) begs Your Holiness to inscribe the Blessed (name of Saint-to-be) in the catalogue of the Saints of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and to

ordain that he be venerated as a Saint by all the Christian faithful."

The Pope himself does not answer. One of the papal prelates answering in the Pontiff's name says that His Holiness has no more ardent desire than that the canonization be accomplished. But more time and prayer are necessary before taking so important a step. The Pope prostrates himself in prayer as the Litany of the Saints is chanted.

Then once more the same petition is made, but this time "more earnestly" (*instanter, instantius*). Once more the "Majestic instancy" of the Holy See manifests itself. The Pope intones the *Veni, Creator Spiritus* which is taken up by the magnificent Sistine Choir.

Now a third time the urgent plea is made, "most earnestly" (*instanter, instantius, et instantissime*).

The Papal spokesman kneels before the Pontiff and with arms outstretched addresses His Holiness: "Arise, Peter, in person, living in your Successor, and speak!" Then turning to the assembled faithful the same spokesman adds: "And do you listen in reverence to Peter's infallible pronouncement."

At these words all rise to their feet and the Sovereign Pontiff seated on the papal throne in the capacity of Infallible Teacher and Head of the Universal Church makes the following solemn declaration. A microphone carries his voice to the farthest mission outpost in Christendom.

"In honor of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity, for the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increases of the Catholic religion, by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and by Our own; after mature deliberation, ever imploring the Divine Assistance, by the advice of our Venerable Brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops present in the Eternal City, We decree and define as a Saint, and We inscribe in the catalogue of Saints the Blessed (name of Saint) ordaining that his memory be celebrated with devotion every year in the Universal Church."

Then the jubilant response of the faithful to the conferring of the honor of honors on one of their own bursts forth in a *Te Deum* intoned by the Holy Father. The silver trumpets have pealed out with heraldic brilliance from high above in the dome. The mighty bells of St. Peter's reverberate through the basilica and

three hundred bells throughout the city of Rome catch up their message to relay it to all the world.

The Sovereign Pontiff, thereupon, offers the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Immediately after the Gospel—which like the Epistle is chanted both in Latin and in Greek—the Pope delivers a sermon on the new Saint.

At the Offertory comes one of the most colorful scenes of the entire day and a unique feature of the canonization Mass. The Pope receives at his throne a series of symbolic gifts. The offertory procession is made up of Cardinals, relatives of the Saint being honored, and other important personages. The gifts will include such items as huge sixty pound candles decorated in honor of the new Saint, two gold vessels containing the hosts for the Mass, gold and silver casks containing wine and water, a cage with two turtle doves, another with two pigeons, and a third with a number of other small birds such as canaries.

The moment of consecration is especially impressive. Just before the actual words all the attending guards drop to their knees, bringing down their swords in unison. Then the mellow trumpets from somewhere up in the dome play softly and reverently through both elevations. It is so still in the entire basilica during the consecration that the only sounds to be heard are the seemingly distant trumpet music and the chirping of the canaries in the cages which have been placed near the altar. The silence is doubly impressive in that huge sea of faithful.

After the papal blessing at the end of Mass, the Pontiff goes to the *Sedia Gestatoria* to be borne out of the basilica amid the acclamations of the host in St. Peter's. But just before he leaves the Sanctuary is enacted a final little scene of special interest. A Cardinal Archpriest and two Canons of St. Peter's approach and kneel at His Holiness' feet. The Cardinal in the name of the faithful and in gratitude for their being honored with a new Saint, offers to the Pope a little Mass stipend—a purse of small coins. It is offered: "For a Mass Well Sung."

It will be of interest now to look back to see what preceded the glorious finale to the cause of canonization in St. Peter's; namely, to review the beatification-canonization process itself.

In the story of beatification, a necessary prelude to canonization, there are four general phases; the *Informative Process*, the *Introduction of the Cause*, the *Apostolic Process*, and a series of

*Four Judgments* of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and the Sovereign Pontiff.

The first of these, the Informative Process, is subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese in which the Process occurs. The last three phases are under the direct jurisdiction of the Sacred Congregation and the Holy Father.

### THE INFORMATIVE OR "ORDINARY" PROCESS

The Informative or "Ordinary" Process is nothing more than an ecclesiastical fact-finding court held in the diocese in which the Servant of God, whose cause is under consideration, lived, died, or worked miracles. Its function is to ferret out all possible information regarding the writings, the fame for sanctity, the virtues and the miracles attributed to the Servant of God. These facts are then relayed under seal to Rome for the remainder of the beatification process.

But who starts things moving in the first place? It is of interest to note, that it is usually one of the faithful. Some layman or laywoman of good repute—possibly one for whom the Servant of God has wrought some favor in life—or after his or her death—petitions the bishop to set up the process of inquiry concerning the sanctity of their holy friend. In the technical terminology of Canon Law—which governs the entire process of canonization—the petitioner is known as the *Actor*, the one who starts things moving.

Of course, in the case of a nun hidden in a cloister of whom the laity knows nothing, her companions in religion or her religious superiors would be the initial petitioners. In the case of the Little Flower, it was her *Autobiography* that introduced her to the laity. She immediately became a gracious patroness to all who invoked her aid for the heavenly favors she had promised.

It is for the bishop to decide whether or not the time is ripe to begin the investigation. One condition only is laid down regarding the time. The Informative Process must be begun within thirty years after the death of the Servant of God. If the bishop fails in this, he must give an account to the Holy See when the Cause is finally submitted to Rome, as to why the Informative Process was delayed; he must show that fraud, deceit or culpable negligence was not responsible for this delay.

The reason is obvious. After thirty years, most of the contemporary witnesses to the life of the Servant of God will be dead. Hence those who knew him or her will no longer be able to testify in the Process.

The Informative Process has three phases: (1) the Informative Process proper; (2) the Examination of the Writings of the Servant of God; and (3) the *non-cultus* investigation.

(1) The *Informative Process proper* is, as its name indicates, a gathering of all available material on the fame for sanctity or heroic virtue of the Servant of God and the miracles wrought during life or after death through his or her intercession. A Postulator of the Cause is appointed by the bishop. He is to act as "counsel for the defense."

It is now that the famous "Devil's Advocate" makes his first appearance. He is appointed by the bishop from among the priests of the diocese. His duties are to see that the Church's good name is safeguarded from fraud or deceit throughout the Informative Process. His real title is far more appropriate—the Promoter of the Faith. He will see that the whole truth about the Servant of God comes to light—the bad (if there is any) as well as the good. His task it is to see that the witnesses who are examined testify only to fact, and not to pious stories that have, like old wine, mellowed with the years.

He must see that all available witnesses who knew the Servant of God well in life, or witnessed miracles during the lifetime or since the death of the candidate for sainthood, are present to give their testimony before this court of ecclesiastics appointed by the Ordinary. The judges are, of course, of the clergy, preferably Doctors of Sacred Theology or of Canon Law. Official notaries are appointed to take down all the testimony submitted by the witnesses. The bishop himself is the presiding judge at the Informative Process, unless he expressly delegates another judge to preside.

In the course of the Process itself, every conceivable bit of information bearing on the cause is unearthed. A set of carefully prepared questions is drawn up in advance to assure thoroughness in the examination of the various witnesses.

Although the "Devil's Advocate" does not cross-examine the witnesses personally, he may have the presiding judge put perti-

nent questions to the witness to bring out some point of information or other which he deems should not be overlooked.

The very title "Informative Process" indicates that no final decision is reached here as to the sanctity of the Servant of God. The data gathered is sealed up. One copy of these official "Acts" or report is sent to Rome; the other copy stays in the diocesan archives—sealed and so sacro-sanct that these "Acts" may not be opened without express permission of the Holy See. It is of interest to note here that Canon Law prescribes that these reports must be *hand-written!*

(2) The second phase of the Informative Process (*de scriptis*) concerns the writings of the Servant of God, which are submitted to the Sacred Congregation of Rites together with the "Acts" of the Informative Process.

The chief responsibility for gathering all available writings of the candidate for beatification falls on the Promoter of the Faith. As soon as he is appointed by the bishop, the "Devil's Advocate" begins to round up all available writings of the deceased. Sermons, letters, diaries, autobiographical writings, books—printed, hand-written or dictated—all must be investigated.

Suppose you have a letter or a holy picture with a little message written by the holy person to you. You treasure it privately as a relic and are unwilling to part with it. What then? Or suppose it is a religious who is being "investigated," and the religious superior does not want to yield up the precious letters of the deceased.

Too bad! The Promoter of the Faith may not come around with a gun, but he may "search out" all pertinent documents and if he wants them, you'll just have to make the sacrifice. Here is the one hope for you. If you *must* keep that treasured autograph letter, a faithful copy by an official notary of the trial or a notarized photostatic copy will save your "autograph." But private individuals aren't granted this privilege as a rule; libraries are the more usual recipients of this favor—and for obvious reasons.

(3) The third phase of the Informative (or diocesan) Process is the *non-cultus* decision. It must be proved that no premature *public* veneration-as-a-Saint has been paid the person in question. The grave is examined; letters and prayers that might indicate such misplaced public devotion are sought out by the "Devil's Advocate."

Prayer leaflets circulated to encourage private prayer for the beatification of the Servant of God, or to petition the deceased for a miracle (a necessary step toward that goal as a matter of fact), are quite permissible.

This all-important decision of the diocesan court, of *non-cultus*, is then sealed and submitted to Rome. If an unfavorable or *cultus* decision is reached, it means further investigation and postponement of the Cause. For all practical purposes it means that for a long, long time to come (and perhaps forever) the curtain falls, not to rise again.

Thus the *non-cultus* decision is the only formal conclusion reached in the Informative Process. The decision as to the heroic virtue and miracles is left entirely to the Holy See.

### THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CAUSE

It will be well to note again that only the ordinary path toward beatification and canonization is being considered here. There are several possible variations from this route that sometimes come into a particular canonization for one reason or other. But it would only confuse the issue to treat these in detail here.

It was noted in the Informative Process that only one decision was rendered by the Diocesan Court—that of the *non-cultus*. They passed judgment as to whether or not the Servant of God had been indiscretely venerated before Rome gave official approval *via* beatification. The other two functions of the Ordinary Process were to gather material *àpropos* of the Cause, for the Sacred Congregation of Rites—the Writings of the Servant of God and all available material as to the reputed sanctity and miracles of the deceased.

Hence the first step at Rome in the Introduction of the Cause is the "examination of the writings." An official commission of Doctors of Theology is appointed by the Sacred Congregation's Cardinal *Ponens*, as he is called. Paralleling our Senatorial set-up he might be styled "The Chairman of the Canonization Committee" of the Sacred Congregation. Should the writings be especially voluminous, as would have been the case in the cause of St. Robert Bellarmine or St. Alphonsus Liguori, the task will be divided up among a number so as to lighten the burden on any one examiner.

The identity of the examiners is kept secret by the Cardinal *Ponens*. The General Promoter of the Faith alone shares this secret, since he is responsible for uncovering any material that might disclose the unworthiness of the candidate for this highest honor of the Church.

This new "Devil's Advocate" has, with the Postulator of the Cause and the Cardinal *Ponens* just mentioned, been designated by the Sovereign Pontiff himself. Moreover, all three must reside in Rome.

But to return to the examination (or "revision") of the writings. Should the Devil's Advocate judge that not all available material has been gathered, he may request that the Holy See authorize a further searching out of material. The responsibility for gathering further material will then be his.

Let us suppose that nothing be found contrary to faith and morals in the writings or even should the Promoter of the Faith find material to which some theologians might take exception—since, after all infallibility is the prerogative of only the Vicar of Christ—the ultimate decision is left to the Supreme Pontiff. To him have been submitted all the opinions *pro* and *con*.

The Holy Father approving, the cause moves forward to the next phase, the Introduction of the Cause proper. A digest of the life, miracles, and virtues of the Servant of God, as gathered in the Informative Process, is provided, for the convenience of the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation. Together with this summary are usually added some of the more prominent "postulatory letters" of distinguished prelates, civil dignitaries, or of the faithful. Then, too, a digest of the objections the "Devil's Advocate" may propose to the Introduction of the Cause, together with the corresponding responses of the Postulator of the Cause, are submitted to the Cardinals. Any oral information bearing on the Cause is strictly prohibited at this session.

Should the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation judge that the Cause is worthy of being officially "introduced" at Rome, their recommendation is referred to the Holy Father for official approval. It will be noted time and again throughout the Process in Rome that each step (if the Cause procedes happily) concludes first with the favorable recommendation of the Congregation, then with the official approval of the Pope. It is his decision alone that determines ultimate approbation or rejection.

With the Pope's signing of the Commission for the Introduction of the Cause, the Apostolic Process proper is in order. However, either prior to or after the Introduction of the Cause, the *non-cultus* decision of the Diocesan Tribunal must be ratified by the Sacred Congregation and the Pope. Although it belongs, strictly speaking, to the Introduction of the Cause, it usually occurs *after* the Commission for the Introduction of the Cause has been signed by the Holy Father.

### THE APOSTOLIC PROCESS

Like the Informative Process, the Apostolic Process is a fact-finding commission. "Remissorial letters" are sent out to the Ordinary of the diocese in which the Informative Process occurred. The bishop is instructed to preside at this new ecclesiastical court of investigation unless the Congregation of Rites specifically designates another presiding judge, should the bishop so wish. Five judges at least are appointed by the Sacred Congregation. In addition, the tribunal must include the Promoter General of the Faith and two Sub-promoters. For a valid session, at least three of the judges and one Sub-promoter of the Faith must be present. This Apostolic Process must begin its investigations within two years of the date that the remissorial letters are opened at the Chancery office.

Investigations of the Apostolic Process are twofold: concerning the fame in general of the Servant of God's sanctity; and secondly, a thorough investigation into specific virtues and miracles attributed to the one whose cause has been introduced.

The first inquiry may be, and often is, dispensed with, should the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation of Rites and the General Promoter of the Faith judge that further inquiry is unnecessary. In the case of martyrs, even the miracles may be dispensed with by the Holy Father—usually, however, only following the recommendation of the Sacred Congregation. In other words, it is the *heroic sanctity* of the Servant of God that is the pivotal point of the entire beatification investigation, the *sine qua non*.

The Apostolic Process is a second and confirmatory fact-finding tribunal now under direct Roman supervision. All competent witnesses who had first-hand acquaintance with the Servant of God or with any of the miracles are examined and their testimony recorded. The testimony of heretics and infidels is acceptable if

the reliability of their word can be established. Among those, however, who are specifically *excluded* as witnesses in the Process are the confessors of the Servant of God, the Postulator of the Cause, advocates, Procurator and any judges in this or the Informative Processes. All the information thus gathered must be sealed and transmitted to Rome.

Finally, sometime before the conclusion of the Process on the specific virtues of the Servant of God, Canon Law prescribes that an examination and identification of the remains of the deceased be made.

Now follow four judgments or decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites approved by the Holy Father which are the prerequisites to the formal beatification ceremony.

### THE FOUR JUDGMENTS

The four judgments are these: (1) the validity of the Apostolic Process; (2) the heroicity of virtue of the Servant of God; (3) the authenticity of the miracles ascribed to the deceased; and (4) the *de Tuto* decision.

(1) *The Validity of the Apostolic Process.*

The first approbation of the Sacred Congregation concerns the validity of the Apostolic Process—whether or not it was conducted according to the prescriptions of Canon Law. Only five members of the Sacred Congregation are absolutely necessary for this judgment—the Cardinals Prefect and *Ponens* together with three others appointed by the Pontiff. Four other officials must, however, also be present. The Promoter General of the Faith is, of course, one of the four.

(2) *Heroicity of Virtue.*

It is at this point of the route to the altar that the well-known "Fifty year rule" obtains. Unless the Holy Father dispenses from the rule, the consideration of the heroicity of virtue of the candidate for sainthood *cannot begin until fifty years have elapsed* since the death of the Servant of God. Mother Cabrini and the Little Flower were both dispensed from this rule.

This judgment is really the all-important one of the entire process of beatification. For the *sine qua non* of sainthood is the practice of heroic sanctity during life or at least, *via* martyrdom,

at the moment of death. It is of special interest to note here that in the case of martyrs, the *cause* of martyrdom—the intention of the executioners must be definitely ascertained before making the final judgment.

Three separate congregations or sessions are prescribed for this phase of the beatification process; Ante-preparatory, Preparatory, and General. The first or Ante-preparatory Congregation takes place before the Cardinal *Ponens* together with official prelates and consultors. They examine the summary of the evidences of heroicity of virtue as gathered in the Apostolic Process together with the digest submitted at the Introduction of the Cause.

The question proposed for solution at each of these three congregations is whether the Servant of God practiced both toward God and neighbor in heroic degree the three theological virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity and the four cardinal virtues of Prudence, Justice, Temperance and Fortitude.

The second or Preparatory Congregation holds its sessions in the Vatican Palace. All the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation are to attend. The report of this session is submitted to the Holy Father.

The final or General Congregation also meets in the Vatican Palace, but this time in the presence of the Holy Father. A new summation of all available material is weighed by the prelates; and a vote on the question of heroicity of virtue is taken. The Cardinals' vote may be *affirmativa*, *negativa*, or *suspensiva*.

Strictly speaking, of course, this vote of the Cardinals is only consultative. The ultimate decision rests with the Pope. But if the vote is negative, it is almost certain that this is the final curtain on the Cause. If the vote is affirmative, the usual procedure is for the Pope to wait for some days or even weeks before giving his decision, after prayer and thorough deliberation.

Should his ultimate decision be favorable, he orders the Sacred Congregation to issue in his name a decree proclaiming the heroicity of virtue of the candidate. From now on the title "Venerable" may be used. But there is to be no public *cultus* even now.

(3) *Judgment Concerning the Authenticity of Miracles.*

The third of the four judgments preceding beatification concerns the miracles ascribed to the intercession of the Venerable.

As in the preceding judgment on heroicity of virtue, three separate congregations must consider the question.

The number of miracles required for beatification varies from two to four, depending on the type of witnesses testifying in the Apostolic Process—namely, mediate or immediate, living witnesses, or documentary evidence. Two miracles is the usual number, however. In the technical language of the process, lesser miracles are called *signa*, and greater miracles are referred to as "portents."

Two expert witnesses must testify before each of the three congregations. Should both agree that the evidence justifies the decision of "no miracle," that ends the investigation. If they are divided in their decision at the Ante-preparatory Congregation two new expert witness must be appointed for the Preparatory Congregation; if in the former congregation both are agreed that the miracle was unquestionably genuine, only one witness need testify at the later congregations.

The procedure at the third or General Congregation is the same as that outlined for the consideration of heroicity of virtue. The ultimate decision as to whether or not the miracles are approved as genuine rests with the Pope following the favorable vote of the Cardinals. And again the Papal decision is customarily delayed a few days after the recommendation of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

(4) *Judgment* de Tuto.

The final decision to be reached is the resolution of this question: "Is it safe to proceed to the beatification of the Servant of God?" After the decree approving the miracles has been issued, a new congregation must be convoked to discuss the final judgment: *de Tuto.*

After the "doubt" is discussed and the vote of the Cardinals taken, their recommendation is referred to the Pontiff, although the discussion has taken place in his presence. As a rule, the Pope waits until a Sunday or feast day to announce his favorable decision.

The four prelates who usually are summoned to assist at the Holy Sacrifice offered by the Pope prior to the announcement of his decision are the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation, the Cardinal *Ponens*, the Promoter of the Faith and the Secre-

tary of the Congregation. Upon the completion of the Mass, the announcement is made.

With the formal issuing of the decree *de Tuto* by the Sacred Congregation, the Pontiff appoints a date for the Solemn Beatification in the Vatican Basilica. Rather elaborate arrangements in St. Peter's are to be provided—though they are in no way comparable to those made in preparation for canonization. A portrait of the *Beatus*, and pictorials representative of the miracles approved for the beatification are to be provided by the decorating committee appointed for the occasion.

The solemnities of the beatification ceremony itself begin with the celebration of Mass in St. Peter's by some prelate, usually one who has had a conspicuous interest in the Cause. This Mass is celebrated in the presence of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

The Holy Father himself is not present nor does he make the official pronouncement. The Papal decree of beatification is read by the Secretary of the Congregation immediately after the Gospel. It takes the place of the sermon. At the conclusion of the reading, the picture of the new *Beatus* or *Beata* is unveiled above the altar. Then the Mass continues. In the afternoon, about the time of Vespers, the Holy Father makes his appearance at St. Peter's to venerate the new Blessed.

The special privileges accorded by the Holy See in connection with beatification are permissions to celebrate solemn triduums in honor of the new Blessed; to insert the name in special martyrologies—this especially applies to the litanies and martyrologies of the religious congregation of which the Blessed (if a religious) was a member; and by special decree, an annual date is set for Mass and an Office of the new Blessed. This privilege is restricted to a certain locality or congregation and does not apply to the universal Church.

### CANONIZATION

Let us look now at the canonization process itself. It is comparatively simple when contrasted with the beatification processes. For it is nothing more than a repetition of the beatification routine in Rome minus the three congregations concerned with the heroicity of virtue. The Beatification judgment on that score is final.

The Introduction of the Cause of canonization must follow the working of miracles obtained through the invocation of the

Blessed—miracles occuring *after* the beatification. Hence, the miracles become a mark of God's approval of the honors paid His servant by the Church.

When at least two well-authenticated miracles have been established, the Postulator of the Cause petitions the Sacred Congregation of Rites to re-open the Cause of canonization. If the evidence submitted by the Postulator seems to warrant such a step, the Sacred Congregation issues the requested decree—with Papal approval—authorizing the resumption of the Cause of canonization. New processes for the investigation of the alleged post-beatification miracles are authorized and conducted.

The subsequent steps follow the same pattern and sequence as those already described in the beatification processes: the investigation or process with the thorough examination of witnesses and gathering of all available material on the miracles; then at Rome the judgment approving the validity of the processes according to the prescriptions of Canon Law; the triple congregation and judgment on the authenticity of the miracles followed by the official Papal approval.

Then once more the question *de Tuto* is proposed in a general congregation in the presence of His Holiness. A favorable vote by the Sacred Congregation brings the matter to the Pope for final approval. If and when he deems it appropriate, the Holy Father orders the issuing of the decree *de Tuto*. It is safe to procede to the solemn canonization of the Blessed.

Because of the great expense involved in the elaborate decorations prepared at the Vatican Basilica for a solemn canonization, the usual practice is to canonize several Saints together. It might be interesting to note in passing that the very minimum of expense for the entire beatification process was at the turn of the century estimated at twenty thousand dollars; that of canonization at an additional thirty thousand dollars. But the "preparation expenses" for a single canonization since then have run far above this figure.

As a rule, the canonization is preceded or followed by a solemn triduum or novena both at Rome and in the locality where the Saint is particularly venerated. The final glory in St. Peter's itself has already been described.

THOMAS A. HALLEY, S. J.

*St. Mary's College,*
*St. Marys, Kansas*

## CATHOLIC ACTION MAKES PROGRESS

*"The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable . . . The momentous seriousness of the present state of things fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men discuss it, practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes, all are occupied with it—and there is nothing which has a deeper hold on public attention."*

The above quotation might have been written yesterday. Actually, it appears in the opening paragraph of *Rerum novarum*, which was given to the world on May 15, 1891. Unfortunately for Society, Pope Leo's timely warnings either went totally unheeded or were applied in measures that proved "too little and too late." Hence, over a half-century later, it is increasingly evident that "the elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable," while the "present state of things fills every mind with painful apprehension."

That society required the too-belated application of his predecessors' modern social reforms was apparent to Pope Pius XI. Hence, on May 15, 1931, he dramatically focused attention on the principles of *Rerum novarum* in the Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno.*

Another historic document, it not only listed the evils of modern society, but presented practical solutions. Given to the world in the midst of a wide spread depression, the Encyclical was effective in awakening men's minds to the wealth of wisdom in Papal teachings. It served as the spark which set aflame new fires of Catholic Action, the truly Christian offensive which characterized the Pontificate of Pius XI.

Yet this year, 1946, fifteen years after *Quadragesimo anno*, still finds the world in serious turmoil. But there is a positive ray of hope in the fact that Christian social thought, as expounded by the Papacy, is influencing our times. Through Catholic Action, the principles of the Encyclicals have become a force in public life. Contact has been made with the enemies of Christian Social Order. Increasing each day is the number of thinking men who consider Papal teachings as the *only* guide to social order. The opinions of the hierarchy in public discussions and conferences on important issues are accepted for serious consideration. While there is greater work remaining to be done, the gains of past

years should be recognized as an important turning point in the history of the influence of the Church in American public life. A continuance, and an intensifying of our united efforts, should bring even greater benefits in the near future. Slow progress is frequently the more lasting. Said Pius XI in 1931:

> The doctrine of *Rerum novarum* began little by little to penetrate among those also who, being outside Catholic unity, do not recognize the authority of the Church; and thus Catholic principles of sociology gradually became part of the intellectual heritage of the whole human race. Thus, too, We rejoice that the Catholic truths, proclaimed so vigorously by Our Illustrious Predecessor, are advanced and advocated not merely in non-Catholic books and journals, but frequently also in legislative assemblies and in courts of justice.

Fifteen years after, it can be said that Catholic principles are not only "part of the intellectual heritage of the whole human race" but have been incorporated in laws of nations to the benefit and happiness of the people concerned. Where Papal teachings have been scorned, the plight of the people is miserable beyond description. Social progress has been made, and this despite the war and the confusion that accompanies it. In America, the practical application of Papal teachings has very decidedly improved our social structure.

If the progress is not as great as desired, or if the effects are not too evident, it is probably due to the influence of the larger number of organizations of unbelievers and Communists who zealously propagate un-Christian doctrines in every class of society. As pointed out by Leo XIII and repeated by Pius XI: "The Church insists, on the authority of the gospel, upon those teachings whereby the conflict can be brought to an end, or rendered, at least, far less bitter."

With reference to America, if the conflict is not "far less bitter," than desired, it must be admitted that conditions have been bettered through application of Christian social principles. Despite the inferior numbers of Catholics, who are organized, there are many men, imbued with the spirit of Christ, who are able to "maintain successfully, both in national and international assemblies, the rights and legitimate demands of Catholic laborers, and to assert the saving principles on which Christian society is based."

Applied to *Quadragesimo anno* could be the words of Pius XI in writing of the benefits to society from *Rerum novarum:* "Were we to enumerate these benefits even in a cursory way, it would be necessary to recall almost the whole social history of the past forty years."

Likewise, the benefits, over the past fifteen years from the combination of the Encyclicals and Catholic Action, would for America, be an account of the religious and social progress of each diocese together with state-wide and national movements.

Pius XI called upon the laity to assist in the apostolate of the hierarchy, and the response has been magnificent. It would be difficult to mention a single branch of Social Science which has not felt the influence of the gospels; even where action has not readily followed, at least, the guiding chart has been unfolded and the way to right and justice has been pointed out. Since removal of ignorance is one of the first steps toward improvement, the time is opportune for more concerted action through the united efforts of Bishops, priests and laity. No one would say that this social progress is the result of new principles of Christ which have suddenly been unearthed in the Papal archives; what is new is the Pius XI method of bringing Christ's teachings into public life, that is, Catholic Action. Originally subject to continuous and, at times, heated debate, Catholic Action is emerging from the fray as *the* movement of our times. Pius XI was able to enumerate a host of benefits, forty years after *Rerum novarum.* Only God knows what a beautiful story may be written when Catholic Action has had an opportunity over a similar period to affect the lives and living of all mankind.

Hopeful and comforting it is that order and plans of a practical sort are being evolved from the many component parts of Catholic Action.

Since Catholic Action is indeed something very great, it necessarily is difficult to understand. At the outset, there was too much of a hurry to apply the remedy without first examining the patient. Unheeded was the advice of Leo XIII, who gave the following caution to those who would organize Workmen's Associations, the forerunner of Catholic Action: "We do not deem it possible to enter into definite details on the subject of organization; this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and scope of the work to be done, on

the magnitude of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and time—all of which must be carefully weighed."

If such care was advised in reference to associations which had only one phase of the social question as prime objective, what even greater caution, study, and experience were necessary in the field of Catholic Action, through which *all* society is to be reestablished on the Christian plan.

Yet, despite confusion and misunderstanding, there has been remarkable progress. But the laborers are few in the field of Catholic Action. There is immediate need of willing, trained leaders in the clergy and laity. "No easy task is here imposed upon the clergy, wherefore all candidates for the sacred priesthood must be adequately prepared to meet it by intense study of social matters" (*Quadragesimo anno*).

It is said that "nothing succeeds like success." Perhaps, then, interest in Catholic Action may be stimulated through a review of the problems in the development of Catholic Action together with a general account of the vast program of Catholic lay activities which, although only a part of Catholic Action, have progressed, largely as a result of Catholic Action. Considering what has been done in the pioneering stage, it must be concluded that complicated, or not; confusing, or not; un-understandable, or not; mysterious, vague, impractical—Catholic Action must be perfected to become a practical plan for the solution of modern ills in society.

### IN RESTROPECT

Although slightly more than fifteen years have elapsed since Catholics became conscious of the term "Catholic Action," the beginnings of the movement may be traced as far back as Pius IX who saw the need for intensified work on the part of both clergy and laity to serve as a Christian reaction against the disastrous Revolutions which grew out of Humanism and Rationalism. When Pius IX became a prisoner in the Vatican, he served as a living symbol that the modern world wished to be rid of religion; the Head of the Church could dwell peaceably within the confines of the Papal palaces, but neither he, nor his message was to penetrate the lives of men. It was permissible for the Church to exist, but men did not want her intrusion in public affairs.

The Encyclicals of Leo XIII came to point out the evils existing in the world because of the denial of basic gospel directives. Leo endeavored to prepare for the full work of Catholic Action with his summons to workers and employers to unite in the study and application of true Christian principles. This Pontiff repeatedly warned society of its approaching collapse unless an improved social doctrine was accepted in public life.

The two Popes of the first World War, Pius X and Benedict XV, used every power in their command to make revealed Christianity a force in the lives of men and nations.

With Pius XI, the whole idea of Catholic Action seemed to have crystalized, and "not without Divine inspiration" came his decision to make Catholic Action a specialized department in the organization of the Church. Catholic Action was to Pius XI the object of his closest attention and affection down to the last days of his life. What his predecessors had feared, Pius XI saw. The misery of the working classes in the world-wide depression; impoverished millions everywhere; an almost utter collapse of decency; utter disregard for the sublime dignity of man; demagogues seizing upon the disorder to advance their destructive philosophies even to militant atheism, and organizing the desperate masses to take over governments wherein un-Godly theories could be made matters of law with a consequent appalling loss of souls. With prophetic eye, Pius saw even worse injuries to be inflicted upon the Mystical Body of Christ. So with courage and zeal he launched the bark of Catholic Action as a means to correct the evils of our times. Through an organized apostolate of the laity working under the direction of the hierarchy, he hoped to bring into public life the sound Christian directives contained in Papal teachings. His "compassion on the multitude" was ever that of the true Father of Christendom.

With Pius XII came the war and the disruption of many lay societies with necessary altering of plans of action for others. Attention was turned to immediate needs resulting from total war. Yet the reigning Pontiff gave repeated encouragement to the work of Catholic Action whose spirit was expressed in his early Encyclical on the Mystical Body. Furthermore, by his example in continuous audiences, in innumerable interviews, in tiring conferences with special delegations of representatives of all races and creeds, in dramatically-timed ceremonies, in ap-

pointments of Cardinals throughout the world, the present Holy Father has given every evidence of his desire to bring Christ into the world as an influence to every class and profession. In recent audiences with Catholic Action chaplains, He has given definite indications that he wishes to continue the program of Pius XI, "to re-conquer the masses for Christ" through Catholic Action.

As old as the Church is the desire to make Christ and His doctrine publicly recognized; needed, according to the mind of the Papacy, was a specific plan to accomplish that end. Catholic Action is that plan. Directed at a truly modern problem, Catholic Action not only forms the individual on the Christian model, but goes further into all branches of society to eliminate social evils which destroy man's temporal well-being and develop social institutions whereby men's souls may be saved. This two-fold purpose of Catholic Action is one of its distinguishing charasteristics.

### AMERICA STRUGGLES TO COMPLY

With the Papacy using every possible modern means to preach Christ, the laity understood that the call for action had been sounded. Catholic Action became the cry from grade-school lads to greying pastors. There was much talk and some action.

Confusion was inevitable in the United States. Previous to this universal teaching on Catholic Action, there were in existence, and flourishing, organizations and societies which protected and advanced Catholic interests over a wide field. Following World War I, the National Catholic Welfare Conference was established in Washington. Composed of departments to advance Catholic projects, it likewise gave encouragement and support to various societies and study groups throughout the nation. American Bishops met annually in Washington to discuss specifically American problems. Their annual statement, given to the secular press, presented Christian teachings to their flocks. There arose many new societies of the laity who were intent on working with the hierarchy for a renewal of Christian living.

Europe responded to the Papal plea for Catholic Action. And there was some confusion when attempts were made to adopt for America the system which was producing a brilliant renaissance of religion in Europe. A system known as "Jocism" had developed in Belgium and France and had spread rapidly throughout the continent. Watched closely by Rome, that particular technique

received the heartiest approval of Pius XI. Americans, enticed by this Papal praise of Jocism, investigated that plan to meet the American problem. However, there were details of the continental plan which, while most suitable for Europeans, were doomed to failure on the American scene. As noted above, there were already in existence here, a large number of efficient Catholic organizations united in our particular type of parish life, which included the parochial school system. That set-up was not common to Europe. Therefore, with the difference in national character—and that is very great—it became evident (but only after some time) that the complete Jocist program would never form a successful working plan for Catholic Action in America.

It was discovered (also after some time) that America could use a great part of the Jocist technique within the framework of our already begun Catholic Action program.

Not so evident at the start, it gradually became clear that although the central theme of Catholic Action was the same for all nations, immediate objectives and circumstances would necessitate different programs of action. The almost complete identification of every detail of the Jocist program with Catholic Action delayed the progress of many earnest, well-intentioned workers in this country. It became difficult to enlist new apostles to a movement which was associated with so much that was dramatic and spectacular, never a part of the American religious fare.

But that situation has fairly well cleared up. In widespread use in this country is the Jocist plan of "Observe, Judge, Act," which stands as the most efficient way yet devised of making the theory of Catholic Action practical. It consists of an observation of a situation; a judgment, according to the gospels; followed by a group action to improve a specific condition.

Naturally, there is no Catholic Action without the activity of the laity, but there are other requirements which, in many cases, were completely overlooked. And this was to the disadvantage of Catholic Action. If these requirements were neglected, the only progress would have been toward a host of "nice" societies while the world remained as un-Christian as the Communists desired. Such societies had failed in preparing even their members to meet modern problems, nor were they so constituted as to be effective, in the manner necessary, outside their membership. So

many of these hurriedly formed, or quickly adapted groups did little more than amuse their members, while they discussed what was wrong with everyone else without the faintest notion of suitable undertakings for the betterment of the conditions or the people who were contributing to the unhealthy condition of society.

In this matter there were well-meaning persons who used the term "Catholic Action" for any particular enterprise at hand. Practically everything "lay" became Catholic Action, as did anything which was done on the advice or direction of the clergy. Declining societies had huge membership campaigns, and that was Catholic Action; funds were raised for parishes, missions, schools—this became "real Catholic Action." Where there were plenty of refreshments, so much the better. Almost anything anyone said, thought or did was as much "Catholic Action" as could be desired. All kinds of Confraternities, Societies, and Sodalities got on the band wagon—they were now "Catholic Action" even though their origin and purpose pre-dated Catholic Action by many centuries. Everything was going—but going where?

There was a lot of confusion and where one kept his sense of humor, a lot of fun. But, it might have been a tragedy, and still may be, if good leaders, becoming overly bewildered, cease their efforts in trying to develop a workable plan for giving our society the full impact of Christ's gospel. Nor did the four-ring circus become any less of a tragedy when some writers, treating the subject in a lighter vein, sent the dart of humor at Catholic Action rather than at the individuals whose misdirected zeal led to ridiculous situations. Such treatment was not, and never will be, in line with the reverence that is due any plan emanating from the Vatican.

It is becoming evident that the problem resulting from early efforts to adopt European procedure has been fairly well solved with the formation of groups who are proceeding in a manner which utilizes existing American institutions and retains a realistic view of the American temperament. With further study, and with numerous priests coming from the seminaries instructed on the four elements of Catholic Action, there is good reason to believe that the over-emphasis on "laity" will subside while the

question of Apostolate, Organization and the Direction of the Hierarchy are recognized as essentials to Catholic Action.

Neglecting the full concept of Catholic Action was not the only source of difficulty. Misunderstandings arose from mistaken notions regarding the *form* of Catholic Action. As always happens when people lose sight of Papal directions, there is trouble at hand. Said Leo XIII "We do not deem it possible to enter into definite details on the matter of organization." The Holy Father is like a wise pastor, who absents himself while the members of the Sodality work out the details of serving their annual chicken dinner.

The Papacy delegates the "definite details" to the "direction of the hierarchy," the fourth point of Catholic Action. The Most Reverend Ordinary must be the authority to determine according "to circumstances of fact and time" what, here and now, should be done. Such procedure is traditional practice. The "Apostolate" is under the absolute direction of the bishop of the diocese. Since the generic element of Catholic Action is "Apostolate," it immediately comes under the official direction of the one whom Rome appoints in a diocese as the chief teacher and authority in all that pertains to that apostolate.

Hence, the objectives and the procedure (or form) will differ according to the circumstances in a diocese. What is the same is the underlying motive to work with the vast, comprehensive aim of Catholic Action to restore Christ in all things through group action of the laity under the direction of the hierarchy.

The question of "form" led to many statements on the part of Pius XI, and others under his direction. There has been an almost continuous dispute on what constituted "Catholic activities" and "Catholic Action." Approved commentators have listed the following four points as essential to Catholic Action: (1) the work of the laity; (2) an apostolate; (3) a definite organization; and (4) under the direction of the hierarchy. Differences of opinion regarding the definite form and the relation of Catholic activities to Catholic Action may be settled by a study of the above four points, which have been explained by numerous writers. They are mentioned here to serve as a guide in reading the following statements which explain the place of Catholic activities.

As Secretary of State, Pius XII wrote to the President of Italian Catholic Action:

> Besides Catholic Action so called, there exist other institutions, associations, and movements which tend, with an admirable variety of organizational forms, either to a more intense ascetical training, or to the practice of piety and religion, and especially to the apostolate of prayer, or to the exercise of Christian charity in all its forms and applications, thus devoting themselves in fact to a broad and efficacious apostolate which is both individual and social, with forms of organization both varied and well adapted to personal initiative—but by that very fact different from the organization which is proper to Catholic Action. These, therefore, are works which one cannot identify with Catholic Action although they can and ought to be regarded as its true and providential auxiliaries.

Pius XI used the term "auxiliaries of Catholic Action" for good works which did not proceed from "official Catholic Action." Auxiliaries are certainly necessary but they are never to be considered as the whole program. They are so important that where they do not exist, one of the first steps in Catholic Action is to bring them into existence. The letter which was written to Cardinal Cintra in 1935 expresses the mind of Pius XI in this regard:

> It is therefore incongruous and gravely injurious if in the parishes or dioceses, other societies of the faithful are established to accomplish practically the very purpose proposed for Catholic Action, that is, societies which are not joined together by any other link whatsoever and which have nothing in common with Catholic Action, or what is worse, enter into sorry competition with it. For thus the particular advantage which such societies might bring to a small number of the faithful are truly nullified by the very serious damages which flow from conflict or from dispersal and division of Catholic forces . . .

Many fine lay organizations have been formed to assist the clergy. However, it must be remembered that too many of these achievements in the field of lay activity only merit the classification of "good basic training." Unaccomplished is any deep penetration of the enemy lines of un-Christian thought and action. Of course, preparation is necessary, but it is not the battle; and improper or insufficient training can only bring the tragedy of defeat. Until Christian forces are fully organized and equipped with weapons which can only be forged out of Catholic Action,

there can be little hope that the teachings of the encyclicals will affect society in the manner desired.

### BETTER-INFORMED CATHOLICS

A point on which there was no disagreement was that there was a need for a better-informed Catholic laity. Advocated by the hierarchy, and with the guidance of the pastors, many study clubs have been formed. These have been the means of imparting excellent instruction to groups of men, women and young people. History, Art, Apologetics, Liturgy, and Catechism are included in the topics of groups which desire to increase their knowledge of things Catholic. Other specialized groups exist to study the encyclicals; these generally graduate to investigations of particular aspects of the social problem. Finally, there are the vocational groups which consider the problems of their work or profession with an aim to bringing Papal instructions to their particular field of activity. It can safely be said that a study club, or several, is part of most well-organized parishes. And many fine projects have developed out of such groups.

Of study clubs, it must be noted that while they are means of instructing laymen, there is usually lacking a working plan through which others will benefit from their studies. Group action is possible in the more specialized groups, for here, there is an opportunity for the truth learned to become an influence in organized society. Such action is aimed at the masses, more than at the individual.

An example of study club action is seen in the many labor groups that have made a serious and detailed study of the encyclicals while at the same time formulating plans through which their unions would be influenced by these teachings. A group of laymen studying labor relations is a good thing; a group of labor leaders engaged in study of the social encyclicals is a much better thing, especially when each is instructed as to the best practical means of applying these teachings in his particular union. Study groups such as the latter have been influential in curbing Communism in the labor field. In many smaller factories, problems of management and labor are solved through the principles of the encyclicals, and this, thanks to small but hard-working study groups. If one is inclined to be discouraged over the labor situation, a few moments thought should be given to consideration

of what the conditions might be without Christian influence. Given over to radical organizers, workers would be in a hopeless tangle today. Although the situation is complicated, it is far from hopeless. There has been progress.

Catholic Action has made an impression in the Rural Life work in this country. If the city problem of earning a livelihood is a matter for Catholic Action, so is the problem of the farmer. From rural Study Clubs other worth-while associations have been formed in line with Papal suggestions. Groups have established credit unions; co-operatives of many sorts handle problems of raising, marketing and distributing products of the land. In some areas, there are marvelous projects for recreational life combined with cultural and educational programs for leisure time.

The effect of Catholic Action is seen in the improvement of motion pictures through the efforts of the Legion of Decency. Other non-Catholic groups are now working strenuously to co-operate with Catholics in effecting a clean theatre. In this is seen how others than Catholics may be brought to benefit from the encyclicals. Not too many years ago, it was considered hopeless to try to prevent Hollywood from doing whatever it wished. Things have changed since the American hierarchy formed a plan to provide good pictures through making the others financial losses. An outgrowth of the Legion of Decency, another organization, has led a campaign for improvement of literature. Again, a public awareness of what is good and bad has been effected through the combined efforts of the hierarchy and the laity. The achievements of Catholic Action in youth work are evident to all.

The preceding list of benefits is not meant to be complete. And there are omissions which merit as great, or greater, commendation than those selected as examples of what good can be accomplished by working in line with Papal directives. With that much achieved amidst the turmoil of the past years, there is every reason to hope for greater things in the future. It would be a serious omission, however, to neglect a brief account of the work of groups of young Catholics who are preparing themselves to become leaders in what is called "Specialized Catholic Action." These groups are not officially organized on a national scale, but have received the blessing and encouragement of bishops in many dioceses. Through a difficult program of study and action, they aim to train lay leaders who will see the whole picture of the

sufferings being inflicted on Christ's Mystical Body. Their program strikes at causes, rather than effects.

### CONCLUSION

With the world in such dire need of valiant leaders for Christ, with dissension, envy, strife, and greed fomenting new sorrows for the Christian family, there is need for all men to strain themselves to the utmost to give their best efforts and prayers to an organized program of action. Only thus may civilization be preserved from further temporal sufferings and spiritual harm. Each has his part which it is his duty to perform in line with the plea of Pius XI:

"*Let, then, all men of good will stand united. Let all those who, under pastors of the Church, wish to fight this good and peaceful fight of Christ, as far as talents, powers and station allow, strive to play their part in the Christian renewal of human society, which Leo XIII inaugurated in his immortal Encyclical* Rerum novarum. *Let them seek, not themselves and the things that are their own, but the things that are Jesus Christ's. Let them not urge their own ideas with undue persistence, but be ready to abandon them, however admirable, should the greater common good seem to require it; that in all and above all Christ may reign and rule, to whom be honor and glory and power forever and ever.*"

EDWARD J. MATTIMOE

*Bryan, Ohio*

---

### MISSION INTENTION

"More Numerous Mission Vocations" is the Mission Intention for the month of November, 1946.

---

### THE ROCK

The word of Jesus concerning the rock on which He was going to build His Church was not a figure of speech, but the full truth, universally verified. How often has the hardness of this rock been demonstrated to the astonished world, when it was thought that only yielding could save the existence of the Roman See!

—Albert von Ruville in *Back to Holy Church* (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910), p. 50.

## MASS WITHOUT A SERVER

The norm of Canon 813, §1: "Sacerdos Missam ne celebret sine ministro qui eidem inserviat et respondeat," by common consent of moralists and canonists is to be understood as a strict prohibition binding *sub gravi*.[1] The reasons on which such severity is based are that the principal rubrics of the Mass are gravely obligatory[2] and that the Mass is a public act of the Church in which the server acts "in persona totius populi Catholici."[3]

There is agreement that grave and urgent causes will excuse from this positive Church law so as to permit the celebration of Mass without a server. It is felt that in the face of such grave causes the Church does not insist upon her positive laws since thereby she may hinder greater spiritual good or give rise to the snare of scrupulosity. The excusing causes cited by the authors are clearly of such a type, *viz.*, for the sake of Viaticum, for the fulfillment of the Sunday precept by people or priest,[4] for the continuation of the Mass when the server departs and fails to return.[5] Other causes of similar moral weight would be accepted as excusing, *e.g.*, the celebration of a funeral Mass when the server fails to come and no other is available, *etc.* The elements of grave scandal, of scrupulosity, and of great spiritual good are here sufficiently weighty to excuse from the positive law.

Again agreement prevails that the *gravity* of the precept touches the physical presence, and not the suitability of the server. Hence, while it is pointed out that the mistakes of a faulty server should be supplied by the celebrant silently, if possible, and later corrected, yet the use of such a server or even of one who does not

[1] Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome juris canonici*, 6th ed. (Rome: Dessain, 1937), II, 82; Ayrinhac, *Legislation on the Sacraments* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928), n. 90; Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa theologiae moralis*, 26th ed. (Innsbruck, 1940), III, 213, 5; Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1945), III, 115.

[2] Cf. McHugh-Callan, *Moral Theology* (New York: Wagner, 1930), II, n. 2712; Cf. *De defectibus*, X, 1.

[3] Cf. O'Connell, *The Celebration of Mass* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1940), II, 201.

[4] Lehmkuhl, *Theologia moralis*, 10th ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1902), II, 244, would also excuse the priest from the obligation of hearing Mass that day if no other Mass could be heard.

[5] Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *loc. cit.*

know the Latin responses is permitted for a less serious reason. The lack of another server is the usual and sufficient reason encountered in real life. Celebration with such a server is permitted even *devotionis causa*.

Agreement, finally, exists on the conditions under which a woman may be used as a Mass-server. The Code itself guides this agreement by its Canon 813, §2: "Minister Missae inserviens ne sit mulier nisi, deficiente viro, iusta de causa, eaque lege ut mulier ex longinquo respondeat nec ullo pacto ad altare accedat." Two things are here commanded, one, conditionally and *sub levi*, that a woman server not be used save when no male is present, and for a just cause; the other, absolutely and *sub gravi*, that a woman server, if used, not serve at the altar itself but answer *ex longinquo*. All agree that no cause excuses from this first prohibition, and that a priest might say Mass with no server rather than allow a woman to serve at the altar. They admit that a just cause usually would be present in the second case[6] since the celebration of Mass merely from devotion will justify the woman server in the absence of a male.[7] That no male server be actually present is required only *sub levi*[8] so that deliberate use of a female server *ex longinquo*, even when a male server is present, does not exceed a venial sin.

There would seem to be at least a light obligation to obtain a male server if such can be had, for the canon does not permit the free substitution of a woman for a man but only "deficiente viro." On the basis of this, O'Connell concludes that it is not lawful to make it a regular practice (*e.g.*, in convents) never to have a male server, but only a woman to answer—it is difficult to see how there could be a "just cause" for making a practice of having no server.[9] However several moralists are not so severe in their judgments but allow the custom, truly widespread, of having a nun answer from the pews even when a male server might readily be had. It is, they feel, a legitimate custom until abrogated by competent authority.[10] Practically, therefore, while it seems more consonant

[6] Cf. Davis, *op. cit.*, III, 116.

[7] Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *loc. cit.*; also O'Connell, *op. cit.*, II, 202.

[8] Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *loc. cit.*

[9] Cf. *op. cit.*, II, 202, note 16.

[10] Thus Mahoney, in the *Clergy Review*, II (1931), 285; Marc-Gestermann-Raus, *Institutiones morales Alphonsianae*, 6th ed. (Lyons: Vitte, 1934), II,

with the Church's law to have a male server even in such cases, it is not necessary to insist upon this, nor to scruple in celebrating with only a sister-server in convents of nuns.[11]

Beyond these limits the manualists are either silent or not in entire agreement. Of main interest to the priest is the further discussion of the celebration of Mass without any server. The question (for the priest's own conscience) arises in a variety of practical situations of which the two following may be called typical. Often a weekday Mass is scheduled in the Church and no server arrives. This may be termed Case I. It is usually aggravated by the presence of some of the faithful who wish to assist at Mass and to receive Holy Communion. Case II arises when the priest wishes to say Mass privately and has no one to serve, as, for example, during a vacation trip, or while travelling from one part of his mission territory to another. The remaining discussion in this paper centers about these cases and hopes to provide a norm that will be at once practical and theological for use in them and in similar cases.

These two cases have one important thing in common and one important difference. In common there is the inability to obtain a server. There can be no further discussion if a server is actually present or if one can be had without *serious* inconvenience. To permit a Mass without server when one can be had without serious inconvenience would be to render vain the *grave* command of the Church. A grave positive law does not cease unless truly grave extrinsic inconvenience be entailed by its fulfillment. A priest, then, who celebrates Mass privately (or publicly) without any server when one can be had sins seriously. The mere inconvenience (?) involved, *e.g.*, in having a fellow-priest serve one's Mass, or of asking a boy of the district to come to the place of the Mass, does not excuse. The cases here discussed suppose that no server can be had, and that through no carelessness on the part of the priest.

The element of difference in these two cases is more vital. It is this, that the celebration of Mass in Case I is dictated by the public spiritual good of the faithful, while in Case II only the

---

1636; and Cappello, *De sacramentis*, 3rd ed. (Rome: Marietti, 1938), I, 740, who considers it more becoming, generally speaking.

[11] Cf. Noldin-Schmitt, *op. cit.*, III, 213, 6.

spiritual good of the celebrating priest prompts the celebration. This difference, it is felt, is sufficient to support a different solution for each case.

In Case I, then, we have the spiritual good of the faithful prompting celebration when a server cannot be had. Is this a sufficiently grave cause to justify the laying aside of the Church's positive law? An answer in the affirmative seems quite defensible. The following citations and reasoning may be offered in support of this affirmative position:

(1) Davis[12] cites as cause permitting Mass without a server the "giving Holy Communion to the faithful, since for them the graces of Holy Communion are very great." The reasoning of this author is, basically, that the spiritual good of the faithful here excuses from this positive law. Our Case I is often exactly similar, *viz.* when the faithful wish to receive, but even apart from Communion the spiritual good of the faithful is largely advanced by their assistance at Mass. It would appear quite grave to deprive them of Mass here and now and perhaps discourage this practice among them.

(2) Creeden,[13] expressly defends this stand, for after suggesting that some one of the waiting faithful be called upon to serve at the altar, or at least to answer *ex longinquo*, he adds: "Quodsi nec unum nec alterum inveniat, potest solus celebrare in praesentia populi; nam certo apud nos videtur esse gravis causa quod populus secus privaretur Missa quotidiana." Here again the spiritual loss of the faithful is reputed to be a grave cause.

(3) Marc-Gestermann-Raus[14] permit celebration when no server is had if the priest must celebrate daily, or, on a stated day, from benefice or some such title. Now while the daily parochial Mass is not of obligation, yet it may be judged to approximate in moral gravity the causes cited by these authors. This is more especially true when the Mass is announced for a stated day.

(4) Vermeersch[15] notes that indults granted by the Sacred Congregation of Rites for the celebration of Mass without server usually contain the direction that the priest strive to have some

[12] *Op. cit.*, III, 116.

[13] In *Addenda* to *Compendium theologiae moralis* of Sabetti-Barrett, 34th ed. (New York: Pustet, 1939), p. 1135, n. 107.

[14] *Op. cit.*, II, 1636.

[15] *Theologiae moralis*, 3rd ed. (Rome: Gregorian University), III, 296.

one present at the Mass in order to represent the people. In Case I the people are truly represented. This, of course, does not prove the lawfulness of celebration without a server; but it may be argued that a less serious cause will be needed to dispense with the server since the case does not depart *radically* from the mind of the Church on this point.

(5) Cappello[16] states that a priest, who is vested and can no longer await the server may begin and complete the Mass without one. He, therefore, may be cited in favor of the affirmative answer; but we are not prepared to accept the full leniency shown by this esteemed author, as our later consideration will show.

(6) Bonzelet[17] permits Mass without a server in cases of "transient necessity" if it is impossible to have a server, but for continued necessity he demands a dispensation or indult. The meaning of "transient necessity" is not entirely clear but surely Case I would fall under this term. Again here, we are not prepared to accept the full extension of this author's opinion, as will be said.

(7) Augustine[18] gives as his opinion that: "priests need not scruple to say Mass without server, especially where there are some frequent communicants and the boys are in school or on vacation. For there can hardly be a doubt that the spiritual benefit is proportionately greater than the observance of a law which, if too strictly enforced, would diminish religious fervor." This author also argues from the custom of many priests who, influenced by indults once freely given but since revoked, continue to celebrate without server. Woywod[19] rightly takes issue with this reason in that it seemed based rather on abuse than on custom, *i.e.*, on a misinterpretation of those indults. However the other reason cited above still holds, *viz.* that arguing from the spiritual good of the faithful.

(8) Schaaf[20] admits as sufficient causes funeral or wedding masses; and, "perhaps," also if many parishioners were present who would be disappointed by the postponing of Mass, and per-

[16] *Op. cit.*, I, n. 741.

[17] *Pastoral Companion* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1939), p. 13.

[18] *A Commentary on Canon Law* (St. Louis: Herder, 1920), IV, 151.

[19] *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law* (New York: Wagner, 1932), I, 716.

[20] "Mass Without a Server," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, XCI (1934), 298 ff.

haps caused to absent themselves in the future. However, if only a few persons were present he would not allow the celebration of Mass without the server. His authority, then, can be claimed, but only in part.

(9) Canon E. J. Mahoney[21] answers similarly to Schaaf: that the large concourse of people present at Nuptial and First Friday Masses would provide a justifying *incommodum*, but not the ordinary weekday Mass attended by a few devout people.

From all this testimony the following conclusions are offered as enjoying at least theological probability sufficient to make them safe norms in practice: that (I) The spiritual good of the faithful is a grave cause justifying the celebration of Mass without a server when none can be had; that (II) This cause is verified *with certainty* in the weekday Mass attended by a large group of people (funeral, wedding, First Friday, novena masses, *etc.*); and (III) *probably* even in the weekday parochial Mass when attended only by a few.

The first conclusion stands as a deduction from the reasons given by Davis, Creeden, Augustine, Schaaf. The second conclusion enjoys the authority of Davis, Creeden, Cappello, Bonzelet, Augustine, Schaaf, Mahoney and perhaps Marc-Gestermann-Raus. The third conclusion is based upon the explicit authority of Creeden, Cappello, Bonzelet and Augustine, while it does not seem entirely foreign to the mind of Davis; and upon the reasoning that attendance at weekday Mass (a notable spiritual good) is fostered by regular Mass and may be discouraged by unexpected postponements. This seems of sufficient moral gravity to allow the law of the code to be set aside for the individual case. Further in support of this stand it may be remarked that in our country at least no scandal is caused by celebration without a server; and that the presence of some of the faithful safeguards the Mass as a public function of the Church so that it is not absolutely contrary to the mind of the Church. These last two considerations are negative in character, yet they heighten the probability of the opinion offered.

In Case I, therefore, it is held that whenever a regular weekday parochial mass is scheduled with some of the faithful in attendance, and the server does not arrive, the priest may celebrate

[21] *Clergy Review*, XVI (1939), 354 f.

without a server. This is true, *a fortiori*, when the mass is announced, funeral, nuptial, First Friday, novena, *etc.* The number of people present does not change the solution for the presence of even a few at the regular parochial Mass means much spiritually for them and for the whole parish.

What of Case II?

Case II involves the spiritual good of the celebrant alone, *viz.* when he wishes to celebrate ***ex sola devotione.*** The expression "devotionis causa" covers all cases where there is no obligation to celebrate, but where the priest says Mass for his own spiritual welfare, for the glory of God as manifested through each Mass, and for the good of the whole Church to which go the *fructus generales* of the Mass. The question at issue reduces itself to this: "May a priest celebrate Mass when no server is present, *devotionis causa?*"[22]

Let it be noted that here, as in Case I, the complete (inculpable) absence of any server is presumed. Where one can be had, even a woman to answer as best she can, this must be done.

Only a few among the moralists and canonists consulted consider this specific case. Cappello[23] permits the priest to celebrate rather than to forego his Mass "ex qualibet justa et rationabili causa, etiam devotionis tantum." He offers no reasons for this stand. Bonzelet[24] gives the same permission even for the sake of devotion in cases of "transient necessity."[25] Creeden[26] answers our question with the advice that one follow the practice of good priests in the diocese especially if the bishop knows and tolerates the practice. Davis[27] states that it is a "matter of dispute" whether Mass may be said without a server out of devotion or

[22] The celebration of Mass for a stipend or because of a promise may still be considered "ex mera devotione" so long as the Mass may be postponed. However, if the intention is urgent and cannot be postponed, *e.g.*, Mass for the success of a serious operation or a Gregorian Mass, the Mass may be celebrated. It is not said then "ex mera devotione" and the circumstances warrant the use of *epicheia.*

[23] *Loc. cit.*

[24] *Loc. cit.*

[25] He is accepting here one of the conclusions of the writer in *AER*, LXXVIII (1928), 412, to which he refers. Cf. *infra.*

[26] Cf. *loc. cit.*

[27] *Op. cit.*, III, 116.

because one always celebrates. He adds immediately however: "But the prohibition of the canon is quite explicit and some case of real grave necessity must be present to justify Mass without a server." Prümmer[28] would excuse from the law demanding a server those who have a papal indult and also "probabiliter" the priest who could not otherwise celebrate that day.

No other authorities among those consulted were found who treated the case.[29] At times one meets a tendency towards leniency in this matter but nothing definite can be gathered from the statements made. Thus Vermeersch-Creusen state[30] "Hodie attendendum est ad crescentem, in quibusdam regionibus, difficultatem obtinendi ministrum; nec praetereundum est celebrationem esse stimulum fervoris et puritatis"; and Marc-Gestermann-Raus: "Ut notant auctores, facilius hodiedum conceditur celebratio Missae sine ministro, si quis inveniri nequit."[31]

In theological periodicals this case is argued more fully. These discussions will be summarized and their arguments given to make clear the reasoning for and against the position the writer believes should be accepted.

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for 1919 the question is taken up twice[32] (the writers' names are not given) and the position is defended that necessity justifying celebration without server is had "when a priest would have to abstain from celebrating altogether unless he were dispensed from having a server." The following arguments were advanced: (1) that the rubrics are intended as safeguards of decorum but not as obstacles to the offering of Mass even as a private act for the consolation of the priest who wishes to honor God thereby; (2) that moralists, following St. Alphonsus, have in mind the public celebration of Mass when the absence of a server would be a source of disedification; (3) that the traditional emphasis on the Mass as a public service has been tempered by increased recognition of the private Mass as an act of prayer as well as worship; (4) that the Code

[28] *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Freiburg: Herder, 1923), III, 304.

[29] Those consulted were St. Alphonsus, Ayrinhac-Lyddon, Vermeersch, Noldin-Schmitt, Vermeersch-Creusen, Ferreres, Marc-Gestermann-Raus, Aertnys-Damen, Merkelbach, McHugh-Callan, Genicot-Salsmans.

[30] *Op. cit.*, II, 82.

[31] *Op. cit.*, II, 1636.

[32] Cf. *AER*, LXI (1919), 100, 318-23.

simply states the liturgical obligation and when theologians disagree as to the extent of a law, the *sensus communis* of approved authors with regard to the obligation of laws in general may be followed; (5) that under indults once granted the term "necessity" was defined to mean any case where a priest without server would have to forego Mass.[33] Today the Code takes the place of such indults and therefore the same interpretation of "necessity" can be accepted; (6) that conditions in our country are unusual, *e.g.*, distances, frequent Communions, priests travelling alone, *etc.*; (7) that the Code itself permits a woman to respond *ex longinquo* and this is not serving in the strict sense, while moralists advise a priest not to worry about faulty responses of the server. Hence there is not such great insistence upon a true server.

To the above three other reasons were added in a subsequent discussion (1928) in which the same stand was defended, again by an unnamed writer. These are: (8) that the priestly ideals and personal devotion of one accustomed to celebrate daily and to relate his daily life to the Holy Sacrifice are sufficient cause to celebrate without server if necessary; (9) that the Mass is of immense value to divine worship and as suffrage for the Poor Souls and for the militant Church, while the mind of the Church favors daily celebration; and (10) that the law of the Code does not become a dead letter but still governs cases outside such reasonable interpretation, *e.g.*, wanton neglect. His conclusion is that necessity sufficient to justify Mass without server is present "when a priest would otherwise be obliged to omit Mass, offered even as an act of private devotion."[34]

Articles advancing the opposite opinion, *i.e.*, that mere private devotion does not justify celebration without a server, are found in the same *Review*. In one, Forrest[35] concludes that Mass without a server is permitted in the case of specially arranged Masses, as funerals and weddings; the case of the weekday announced Mass with a few persons present is left to others to decide, but he would consider it a grave violation of Ecclesiastical law to celebrate without server on a weekday *ex mera*

[33] Putzer, *Commentarium in facultates apostolicas*, nn. 161 ff. is cited.

[34] *AER*, LXI (1919), 323.

[35] "Mass Without a Server," *AER*, LXXVIII (1928), 403-407.

*devotione.* In another, Schaaf,[36] while permitting Mass without server in the event of funerals, weddings, and the like, and "perhaps" if many parishioners would be deprived of Mass on a weekday, concludes that this would be unlawful when only a few are present since the Church understands the value of the Mass and yet forbids it without server. He mentions the more lenient view, but without any sign of approval.

In the *Clergy Review*, Canon E. J. Mahoney has touched our question several times. In 1931 he drew the conclusion that except in cases of urgent necessity the practice of celebrating Mass with no one present is gravely unlawful save from indult.[37] In 1939 he answered that Mass without server in the presence of a large concourse of people, as at Nuptial or First Friday Masses, would be lawful since the incommodum in such cases is sufficiently great; but that this is not so in the ordinary weekday Mass attended by a few devout people.[38] And in 1941 on a related question he affirmed that even the indult to celebrate "sine ministro inserviente" would not justify celebration with no one present at all.[39]

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* contains the answer to our question as given by Fr. John McCarthy who concludes: "An examination of the law itself, as expressed in can. 813, par. 1, 2, in the light of its history, the fact that the Mass is an act of public worship, the representative capacity of the server, the general principles which govern excusation from law have all led us to the conclusion that the satisfying of private devotion alone does not justify the priest in celebrating a solitary Mass."[40]

In the face of such testimony for and against, what conclusion may one draw? It would appear that the only defensible conclusion is that the celebration of Mass without a server because of private devotion alone is not permitted and therefore is gravely opposed to Canon 813. It is felt that this is the only justifiable conclusion because: (I) there is no sufficient extrinsic authority for the opposite view; (II) the reasons offered do not establish

[36] "Mass Without a Server," *AER*, XCI (1934), 298 ff.

[37] *Clergy Review*, II (1931), 286.

[38] *Ibid.*, XVI (1939), 354 f.

[39] *Ibid.*, XXI (1941), 175 ff.

[40] *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, LVIII (1941), 463.

intrinsic probability; and (III) there is good authority against it.

It is felt that the authority of Cappello, the unknown writers in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, and Bonzelet, who accepts their conclusion, does not establish extrinsic probability. Neither Davis who calls the point disputed, nor Prümmer who calls it probable (on what grounds?) can be adduced as full supporters of the lenient view.

Nor are the reasons advanced in the American periodical cogent. (Neither Cappello nor Bonzelet offers any reasons.) For it may be responded against (1) (above): that the rubrics intend indeed to safeguard the decorum of the Mass and *therefore* they prohibit any act contrary to their commonly accepted interpretation. Hence the assertion that they do not prohibit the celebration of Mass as a private act must be judged gratuitous until support of theologians is advanced. Against (2): The assumption that St. Alphonsus and other moralists had the public celebration of Mass in mind cannot be sustained since St. Alphonsus himself, in reply to an objection that the Decrees of Gratian demand two servers, replied that some apply this to solemn Mass but that St. Thomas asserted the sufficiency of one server for a private Mass.[41] Furthermore, the Code would have formulated its law more carefully were this assumption true. Against (3): True, the emphasis on the Mass as the private prayer of the celebrant has increased with the increase in private Masses, yet always subordinate to its aspect as a public act and therefore subject to all the Church's public regulations in its regard. One such regulation demands a server. Against (4): No *sensus communis* of authors can be alleged or even hinted at as favoring the affirmative stand. This has been shown clearly. There is not even a sufficient division of authority. Against (5): One cannot rightly conclude that the necessity permitting Mass without a server from an indult is sufficient to permit Mass without a server with no indult. Else why the indult? Nor can it be said that the Code supplies the faculties that it displaced; it simply provides other regulations in those matters. Against (6): Conditions in parts of our country are truly unusual enough to justify special indults, but the universal law of the Church cannot be abandoned on that score. Against (7): While the serving of Mass calls both for re-

[41] *Theologia moralis* (ed. Gaudé), III, 391.

sponding and for assisting at the altar, yet the Church makes explicit provision for cases where only one of these can be had, *viz.* just the responses. On parallel grounds theologians universally permit the use of a server who can assist at the altar but cannot respond. No provision and no such universally admitted permission is had for Mass with no server at all. Against (8): Priestly ideals and personal devotion ought to be fostered within the framework of the Church's laws. Against (9): The value of the Mass and the utility of daily celebration were well-known to the lawmakers so that the laws must be interpreted as made with that value taken into account. Against (10): The argument is negative, at best.

Finally, there is authority in open opposition to Mass without a server *devotionis causa, viz.*, Canon Mahoney, Fr. Schaaf, Fr. Forrest and Fr. McCarthy. Each of these gave his answer after considering the arguments proposed in favor of leniency.

It is therefore the conclusion of this discussion of Case II that, in the face of the explicit and grave command of the Church that a server be had at Mass, celebration without a server *devotionis causa* is not permitted but is seriously forbidden. Nor has sufficient weight of authority or argument been advanced to make probable the opinion that devotion alone is a grave cause excusing from the norm of Canon 813.

WALTER W. CURTIS

*Immaculate Conception Seminary,*
*Darlington, N. J.*

---

### THE SACRAMENTS AND THE SACRED HEART

The seven Sacraments are so many inexhaustible fountains of grace and holiness, which have their source in the immense ocean of the Sacred Heart of our Saviour; they are so many flames of a divine furnace from which proceed all spiritual blessings. But the brightest of those flames is the most Holy Eucharist. It is true that this great Sacrament is a compendium of all the wonders of the power, wisdom and goodness of God, but it is also true that it is one of the fruits of the incomparable Heart of Jesus and one of the flames of that wondrous furnace.

—St. John Eudes, in *The Sacred Heart of Jesus* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons 1946), p. 22.

## THE REQUISITES FOR AN INFALLIBLE PONTIFICAL DEFINITION ACCORDING TO THE COMMISSION OF POPE PIUS IX

One hundred years ago, petitions for the definition of the doctrine of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception as divinely revealed Catholic dogma were pouring in upon the Holy See. The movement had become powerful during the reign of Pope Gregory XVI, who died on June 1, 1846. It continued and increased under the rule of Pope Pius IX, who succeeded to the papal throne on June 16 of that same year. Soon after his election, the new Pontiff asked twenty prominent theologians, taken from the ranks of both the diocesan and the regular clergy, to study the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and to submit to him in writing their individual judgments as to its definability. Then, on February 2, 1849, from Gaeta, where he had retired because of the sedition in Rome, he wrote to the bishops of the Catholic Church to ascertain their teaching and the belief of their flocks on the matter of the Immaculate Conception. When well over nine-tenths of the Catholic episcopate had signified their own belief and that of their flocks in this prerogative of Our Lady, Pope Pius IX appointed a special commission, chosen from among the theologians who had already been consulted on the matter of the Immaculate Conception, to investigate the question even more profoundly than had previously been done.

Cardinal Fornari was named president of this special commission. Serving under him were Prosper Caterini, himself destined soon to be called to the cardinalatial dignity, Canon Audisio, Fathers John Perrone, Charles Passaglia, and Clement Schrader, of the Society of Jesus, Fr. Mariano Spada, O.P., and Fr. John Baptist Tonini, O.F.M. Conv. Fr. Tonini died before the actual sessions began, and his place was taken by his fellow Conventual, Fr. Angelo Trullet.

This Commission met for the first time on May 8, 1852. This first session was given over to matters of organization and procedure. In its second and third sessions (May 19, and June 8, 1852), the commission devoted itself to the expression of the principles governing the definability of any doctrine as revealed Catholic dogma, stating first what is not necessary, and then

what must be considered as sufficient for an infallible pontifical definition. In view of the fact that the Church's position with regard to the doctrine of Our Lady's Assumption into heaven is today almost exactly the same as its stand on the teaching of the Immaculate Conception was in 1852-53, these pronouncements on the nature of dogmatic progress should be of great interest to our priests and seminarians.

At its second session, that of May 19, 1852, the commission agreed unanimously on the accuracy of four principles, stating the qualities with which a doctrine need not be endowed in order to be defined as revealed Catholic dogma.

(1) *The fact that there have been conflicting teachings on this subject within the Catholic Church in the past, or, the fact that all have not heretofore agreed on this teaching, does not render a doctrine incapable of definition.*[1] Bishop Augustine de Roskovány's Latin rendering of the Italian summary of the commission's *Acta* makes it clear that the members adduced the example of the rebaptism controversy in support of this thesis. They also pointed to the fact that controversialists on opposing sides of a theological dispute habitually express their willingness to abide by a decision of the Church, thus, in the eyes of the members, expressing their belief that the Catholic Church can pronounce and define even in a matter which has hitherto been discussed freely within its own schools.

(2) *The fact that even authoritative writers can be quoted in opposition to a teaching does not render that teaching incapable of definition.* The members of the commission claimed that this principle is shown as valid through the examination of the history of almost any defined dogma. In particular, however, they pointed to the example of the Council of Trent, which proclaimed the Church's belief in the absolute immunity of Our Lady from all actual sin and imperfection in the face of previous denial of this truth even on the part of Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

[1] In this article I have generally followed the Latin version of the Italian resumé of the *Acta* of this commission published in Bishop Augustine de Roskovány's *Beata Virgo Maria in Suo Conceptu Immaculata ex Monumentis Omnium Seculorum Demonstrata* (Budapest, 1874), VI, 13-19. Brief summaries of these theses will also be found in Cardinal Manning's *The Vatican Council and Its Definitions. A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy* (New York: D. and J. Sadlier, 1871), pp. 240 ff., in Bishop Malou's *L'Immaculée Conception de la Vierge Marie, considérée comme dogme de foi* (Brussels, 1857), pp. 351 ff., and in the brilliant article by Fr. Charles Balić, "De definibilitate assumptionis B. Virginis Mariae in caelum," in *Antonianum*, XXI, 1 (Jan. 1946), 20 ff.

(3) *In order that a doctrine be definable, it is not necessary that there should be explicit, or even implicit, testimony to this doctrine in Sacred Scripture, since it is certain and manifest that the scope of revelation is wider than that of Scripture.* In support of this principle, the members of the commission appealed to the dogmas of infant baptism, of the real and complete presence of Our Lord under each of the Eucharistic Species, and of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son as from one principle.

(4) *In order to show that the doctrine to be defined belongs to Tradition, it is not necessary to adduce a series of Fathers and of of other witnesses reaching back to apostolic times.* The "Tradition" to which the members of Pope Pius' commission referred was the divine Apostolic Tradition, which, together with the Sacred Scripture, is a source of supernatural public revelation. In formulating this fourth principle, the members of the commission took cognizance of the fact that the early monuments of tradition, among which the patristic writings are to be numbered, do not state the entire content of that divine teaching which was delivered to the Church by the apostles.

According to the commission, anyone who denies this fourth principle must logically reject one of the following five truths.

(A) Not all of the doctrine entrusted to the Church as the content of divine public revelation was immediately, at the very outset of the Church's life, set down in writing by the Fathers.

(B) Not all of the ancient *monuments* of divine apostolic tradition (the writings and inscriptions of the early Christians) have survived until our time, even though the tradition itself has survived and is just as perfectly possessed, guarded, and taught by the infallible Church today as it was in apostolic times.

(C) Although the whole content of divine public revelation has always been guarded and presented infallibly by the Church, it has not always been, in its entirety, distinctly conceived and formally expressed.

(D) A doctrine proposed as a part of the divine apostolic tradition by the true Church of Jesus Christ at any one period in its history cannot possibly be in opposition to what has been taught as divinely revealed by the Church at an earlier time.

(E) A doctrine proposed at any time within the true Church of God as a part of divine public revelation must, by reason of the

divine assistance promised and given to the Church, have been taught in the past at least in an implicit manner by the majority of the *ecclesia docens*. Moreover, such a teaching could never have been denied by a majority of the authentic teachers within the Church.

The commission appealed directly for verification of its fourth principle to the procedure of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, to the Lateran Council of 649, under St. Martin I, and to the dogmatic letters of Popes St. Leo I and St. Agatho. The commission found that all of these authorities appealed to the faith of the Fathers and of Tradition, while making no effort to cite sources from the first three Christian centuries. At the same time it noted that they all appealed to texts which, in relation to their teaching, were quite recent.

In formulating and explaining this fourth principle, the commission of Pope Pius IX took into careful account both the continuity and the progress of Catholic dogma. The entire content of divine public revelation was handed over to the Church by the apostolic college. This entire deposit of faith has been taught and guarded infallibly by the visible Catholic Church since its beginning, and will be so taught and guarded until the end of the world. At the same time, however, there has been, and, with God's help, there will continue to be, a definite advance in the appreciation of this body of divine truth within the Church. Teachings which, in earlier ages, were proposed and taught in an inchoate and comparatively indistinct manner have been brought out and stated explicitly in later periods. Both analysis and synthesis have played their parts in this dogmatic progress, which, however, always has been, and ever will be, an advance in the understanding and appreciation of the same one body of truths revealed by God through Jesus Christ, and preached in and to His Church by His apostles.

Hitherto the commission had fixed its attention on marks not needed to show that a certain proposition is capable of receiving an infallible pontifical definition. Now it turned to the consideration of those characteristics which are sufficient to qualify a doctrine as definable. Five of these characteristics were indicated.

(1) *There must be a certain number of solemn testimonies directly pertinent to the proposition in question.* The commission asserted that no one could deny the principle other than by flying

in the face of the constant procedure of the Oecumenical Councils, of the dogmatic letters of the Pontiffs, and, indeed, of the whole economy of the Church. There was a direct appeal to the action of the Council of Ephesus against Nestorius, of the Third Council of Constantinople against the Monothelites, and of the Second Council of Nicaea against the Iconoclasts.

(2) *A proposition is capable of being defined if there can be found one or many revealed principles containing this proposition.* At this point the commission observed that the placing of such "principles" served only to bring out virtual and immediate revelation. Thus, it asserted, from the revealed principle that Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man, it follows that the fact that He has two wills is revealed. In the same way, from the revealed principles that there is one God and that there are three divine persons, and that in God everything is one except for relations of origin, it follows that the doctrine to the effect that the Holy Ghost could not procede from the Father and the Son other than from one principle of spiration is revealed.

This statement, like the ones before it, represented the unanimous teaching of the members of the commission. It is distinctly worthy of note that the commission taught without reservations the definability of a proposition which had been known in previous times only through the light of virtual revelation. It did not, of course, go into the distinction upon which the stand of theologians like Schultes and Tanquerey is based. These writers claim that a properly theological conclusion, that is, one which has been known and has been knowable only by means of a real process of reasoning from revealed principles could never be defined as a dogma of divine Catholic faith. The commission of 1852 made no effort to determine whether or not the proposition contained in revealed principles might be inferred by a process of reasoning in the strict sense of the term.

(3) *A proposition is capable of being defined if it shows a necessary connection with dogmas. In other words, a proposition ought to be accepted as revealed when from the denial of this proposition there follows by logical and immediate necessity the denial of one or more revealed principles.* Such a connection, according to the unanimous teaching of the commission, is equivalent to immediate virtual revelation. As examples of the use of this principle, the members of the commission pointed to two Catholic dogmas,

that which tells us of the existence of a real difference between mortal and venial sins, and that which expounds the truth that the effects of the sacraments do not depend upon the good or the bad character of their secondary ministers. Only by holding the distinction between venial and mortal sins as something revealed can a man assent to the fundamental Christian teachings which tell us that there actually are sins unto death, and that there are sins not incompatible with perseverance in the life of divine grace. Only by holding it to be revealed truth that the effects of the sacraments do not depend upon the good or the bad character of the secondary minister can a man logically believe that these sacraments produce their effects *ex opere operato* and that Jesus Christ is the primary minister of the sacraments.

Once again, it is of interest to see that the commission did not hesitate to ascribe the character of definability to a proposition which had hitherto been known in the light of immediate virtual revelation. The proposition judged as definable in the light of this third principle is just as truly a theological conclusion as is that which is explained in the previous statement. In both cases the proposition which is held to be definable is something known by a process of reasoning. In the one case, the reasoning is considered under the form of a syllogism, in the other, under the form of a dilemma.

(4) *A proposition may be defined as Catholic dogma if it is preached as a part of divine public revelation in the concordant teaching of the actual episcopate.* The members of the commission held unanimously that no one could deny this principle without calling into question the promises of Our Lord Himself, and without rejecting the standard constantly used by the Fathers in demonstrating the articles of faith. The commission pointed to the examples of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Augustine, and Fulgentius, all of whom considered a theological question to have been settled once they had ascertained the teaching on this point of the various Sees of Christendom, and particularly that of the principal one among them.

In proposing this point, which, incidentally, played a great role in the definition of the Immaculate Conception, and which may play a similar part in a forthcoming definition of Our Lady's Assumption, the commission took cognizance of the fact that the Catholic Church is infallible in its teaching always. The teaching

of the Church over the centuries, and the teaching of the Church at any one period of its history, are both unerring statements of the divinely revealed teaching. Thus if the episcopal college, which is not the successor to but actually the continuation of the apostolic college, teaches that such and such a doctrine is a part of divine revelation at any one time in the Church's history, we may be perfectly assured that, by reason of the divine protection and enlightenment given to the Church, that teaching is perfectly correct, and the doctrine in question is perfectly capable of definition as a dogma of divine Catholic faith.

(5) *A proposition is capable of definition when it is shown to be a part of divine public revelation by the practice of the Church.* The members of the commission agreed that, in this principle, the term "practice" referred to external acts of worship and of religion. They agreed that the only practice which could serve to show the revealed character of a theoretical proposition upon which the practice itself is based would have to be universal, solemn, and mandatory. It would have to be universal practice, belonging to the Church Catholic, and not simply to one See or group of Sees. It would have to be solemn, in the sense that this activity would have to be in some way joined to the actual worship of God in the Church. Finally, it would have to be mandatory rather than elective in the Church of God. Thus, according to the commission, a practice within the entire Church, joined to the public cultus within the Church, and imposed upon the faithful by the commands of their legitimate ecclesiastical superiors could be a sufficient sign that the theoretical proposition upon which this practice depended was actually revealed by God.

To explain this fifth and last of their principles, the members of the commission drew up and unanimously approved five theses. First they indicated the basic and obvious fact that every practice of the sort they had indicated is necessarily connected with some theoretical proposition which informs and directs this practice. Secondly they asserted that not every theoretical proposition which informs and governs Catholic practice is necessarily one which is contained in divine public revelation. In support of this contention they showed that the question of baptism or non baptism of a monstrous foetus would be governed by the theoretical decision (from philosophical sources) as to whether or not this particular being could be considered as human. They like-

wise appealed to the existence of certain liturgical feasts. The feast of St. Michael depends, to a certain extent, upon the reality of an apparition of the Archangel: that of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, upon the triumph of Heraclius: that of the Rosary, upon a private revelation from Our Lady. Yet none of these facts can be attested in the content of divine public revelation.

In its third explanatory thesis, the commission asserts that there are unquestionably practices in the Catholic Church immediately connected with theoretical truths which form a part of the content of divine public revelation. In support of this thesis the commission pointed to the axiom: *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi.* It also appealed to the procedure of the Second Council of Nicaea, condemning the Iconoclasts and approving the use and the veneration of images as conformed to the practice of the Church, to that of St. Basil, who used the doxology employed by the faithful to show the divinity of the Holy Ghost, to that of St. Jerome, who appealed to the practice of the Church in proving the legitimacy of the cult of relics against Vigilantius, and to that of St. Augustine, who established the doctrine on the propogation of original sin on a proof drawn from the existence of exorcism. The commission also mentioned the common procedure of theologians, who employ the practice of the Church as one of the *loci theologici.*

The fourth of the explanatory theses put forward by the commission asserts that there is a standard by which we can judge whether or not the theoretical proposition upon which a practice of the Church depends is a part of divine public revelation or not. Such a criterion, according to the fifth and last thesis, may be found either in the character of the proposition itself, or in the testimony of credible witnesses. The commission mentions the fact that certain propositions are such that, within the teaching of the Church, they could have come from no source other than that of divine revelation. An example of this type of proposition is the teaching that St. John the Baptist was sanctified in the womb of his mother. Others could be known naturally or by a process of revelation, and their presence in the teaching of the Church must be explained by some testimony outside of the existence of the propositions themselves.

These were the principles in the light of which the special commission appointed by Pope Pius IX proceded to the considera-

tion of the definability of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady. In the last analysis, they are the principles in the light of which the definability of the doctrine of the Assumption must also be considered. They take cognizance of the definability of a theological conclusion, but they do not limit themselves to the consideration of propositions which can be or which must be deduced from existent dogmatic formulae by way of syllogistic reasoning. Thus they give an extraordinarily complete and perfect picture of that dogmatic progress and continuity which is at once the characteristic and the glory of the Catholic Church.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

*The Catholic University of America,*
*Washington, D. C.*

---

PRIMITIVE PROTESTANTISM

My readers, no doubt, will remember the exceeding joy and surprise with which, at the close of my long search after Protestantism in the first ages, I at length stumbled on a staunch Calvinist in the person of Simon Magus. *"Not by virtuous actions* (said this heretic) *but by Grace is salvation to be attained."* It will also, perhaps, be recollected that, from certain generous scruples, I then hesitated to take advantage of such disreputable authority; and, though long foreseeing that my Protestantism must be heretical descent, yet felt anxious, for the honor of all parties, that it should be of some better breed. To say the truth, too, I was not quite sure that this glimpse of genuine Calvinism might not be, after all, but a chance sparkle, and that I should see nothing more of it. On passing on, however, from the Arch-heretic to the numerous sects that sprung from him I found this feature of the parent faithfully reproduced in all his offspring; I found that they all, in some point or other, anticipated the Reformed lights of Geneva and Wittemburgh; and that if I had, at once, designated Simon Magus as the fount and wellspring of some of the most boasted of the Protestant doctrines, I should have asserted no more than it was now in my power indisputably to prove.

—Thomas Moore in the *Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, no date), p. 109.

# Answers to Questions

## MASS OR STIPEND?

*Question:* If for some reason a pastor does not celebrate the *Missa pro populo* on a certain Sunday, can he subsequently fulfil his obligation, or cancel it, by contributing a dollar to the church funds?

*Answer:* The pastor would certainly not satisfy his obligation or cancel it in this manner. It is the spiritual value of the Holy Sacrifice that the Church requires the pastor to procure for his people on certain days, and the monetary equivalent of the usual stipend is utterly inadequate to compensate for the treasures of grace of which the parishioners have been deprived when their priest has failed to say one of the Masses incumbent on him by reason of his office. However, if the pastor is lawfully impeded from celebrating the *Missa pro populo* on a certain day, he can give a stipend to another priest who is willing to say the Mass, and thus the obligation is fulfilled (Can. 466, §1; 339, §4).

## CUMULATIVE INVESTITURE IN THE SCAPULARS

*Question:* In the July issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, p. 63, it is stated that the faculty to bless and to impose the five scapulars with a single formula includes the right to bless and to impose any one of the five separately. Although the reason adduced for this answer would seem to be valid—that the greater power includes the lesser—does it not fail to take into account the actual legislation of the Holy See regarding this matter?

*Answer:* Our correspondent is correct; the answer given in the July issue does not take into consideration an explicit decree of the Congregation of Indulgences, given Sept. 12, 1883. This decree asserts that the faculty to bless and to impose four or five scapulars with one formula of itself is not sufficient for the valid blessing and imposition of the aforesaid scapulars, but it is necessary in addition that there be had or obtained from the superior of the respective order the faculty of blessing and imposing the

scapulars (Cf. *Rescripta Authentica S.C. Indulgentiarum*, n. 444, *ad* I, p. 680). Accordingly, the power which our bishops possess by virtue of the quinquennial faculties to subdelegate priests to bless and to impose the five scapulars with a single formula (Cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II [Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943], 37) should be interpreted in harmony with this decision—namely, as presupposing that these priests have already received, or are intending to receive, the faculty to bless and to impose the individual scapulars from the superiors of the orders to which the respective scapulars belong (Cf. Bonzelet, *Pastoral Companion* [1945], n. 181).

## THE PROBLEM OF MIXED MARRIAGES

*Question:* Is it correct to assert that a Catholic girl is guilty of grave sin if she begins to keep company with a non-Catholic, cherishing the hope that she will one day marry him?

*Answer:* The statement as it stands is incorrect in the sense that it is inadequate; but it can be made correct by the addition of the qualifying clause "unless she has good reason to believe that she has, or will have before the marriage, a justifying cause for entering this union." The reasoning by which we arrive at this conclusion is quite simple. It is a mortal sin for a Catholic to enter a mixed marriage without a just and grave cause (Can. 1060, 1061); consequently it is a mortal sin to desire or to plan (even with only probability of success) such a union. It must be emphasized that we are referring to a case in which no difficulty is anticipated in regard to the guarantees—a case in which the non-Catholic will unhesitatingly promise complete religious freedom to his wife and the Catholic baptism and education of all the children, and in which it is morally certain that these promises will be fulfilled. There would be an additional reason to condemn the company-keeping as sinful if there were cause to doubt that the non-Catholic would sincerely make and faithfully keep these promises. But, even presuming that there is no reason to doubt the fulfilment of these conditions, company-keeping with a view to marriage is gravely sinful unless it can be foreseen, at least with solid probability, that when the time of the marriage comes there will be a reason sufficient to justify the Catholic in taking the non-Catholic as his or her partner for life.

It is unfortunate that this principle is not better understood by the Catholics of the United States. It seems to be commonly believed that a Catholic is perfectly free to marry a non-Catholic as long as the latter is willing to sign the promises. In view of this erroneous notion, priests should emphasize in their instructions the first condition the Church demands before she will grant a dispensation for a mixed marriage—that just and grave causes call for this marriage (*Urgeant justae ac graves causae* [Can. 1061, §1, 2]). A just and grave cause would be the fact that there is a well-founded hope that the non-Catholic will enter the Church, or the fact that this marriage offers a widow the only means of keeping her children with her and rearing them as Catholics. It would seem that the fact that a Catholic lives in a small community where few suitable partners can be found (*angustia loci*) or the fact that a Catholic girl is somewhat advanced in years (*aetas superadulta feminae*) are not of themselves sufficient reasons, although they can constitute accessory causes (Cf. Quigley, *A Summary of the Canon Law on Matrimonial Impediments and Dispensations* [Philadelphia, 1942], pp. 10 ff.). It should be remembered, too, that however pressing may be the reasons for the marriage, it is forbidden by divine law if there is danger of perversion of the Catholic or of the offspring, and from this prohibition the Church cannot dispense.

It is important to note that the Church may have a sufficient reason for granting a dispensation, which does not constitute a sufficient reason for the Catholic party to contract the marriage. Such, for example, is the reason (so often alleged in petitions for a dispensation) of "danger of a civil marriage" or "danger of apostasy." The Church is justified in granting a dispensation when such a reason is present, because she is thus choosing the lesser of two evils. But, if this is the only reason for the marriage, the Catholic party is objectively committing a grave sin in entering it. Doubtless, because of ignorance, this sin is often only material; and prudence may frequently dictate that the Catholic be left in good faith. For example, if a priest feels that a Catholic girl is likely to contract a civil marriage in the event that a dispensation is refused, he can propose this as the motivating cause in the petition for a dispensation without asking her directly: "Will you marry outside the Church if you are not granted a dispensation?" Neither is it always necessary to tell a Catholic for

whose marriage to a non-Catholic no other reason than *periculum matrimonii civilis* can be adduced that he or she is committing a mortal sin by entering the marriage. Nevertheless, in their sermons and instructions and in their confessional work priests should be mindful of the theological and canonical principles concerning mixed marriages, and do all in their power to deter Catholics from contracting such unions which, as the Code says, the Church "most severely prohibits everywhere" (Can. 1060).

## SEPARATION BECAUSE OF ADULTERY

*Question 1:* May a wife whose husband has been guilty of adultery separate from him without any recourse to ecclesiastical authority?

*Question 2:* May she, for the same reason, institute civil divorce proceedings against him without submitting the matter to the Church authorities?

*Answer 1:* If the sin of her husband is certain and notorious (that is, publicly known and committed in such circumstances that it can in no wise be covered over) the injured wife can separate from him *quoad torum et mensam*, even without consulting the ecclesiastical authorities—although the better course would be to submit her case to them. If the crime was occult, she may separate *quoad torum* on her own authority (presuming, of course, that she is sure of his guilt); but it is a matter of controversy whether or not, in this case, she may on her own authority separate totally. Although the affirmative view is very probable, a woman should always be advised in practice not to use her right to this extent until she has brought the matter to the attention of the diocesan authorities. If she is doubtful about her husband's guilt, she may not separate from cohabitation or marital relations, at least until his guilt has been officially declared by ecclesiastical authority.

*Answer 2:* Even though a wife may be justified in separating from her husband permanently on account of his notorious crime of adultery, and that on her own authority, it does not follow that she is free to institute civil divorce proceedings against him. As regards the United States particularly it is to be noted that the Third Council of Baltimore forbade Catholics to approach the civil court for the purpose of obtaining a separation *a toro et*

***mensa*** without first consulting the ecclesiastical authorities (*Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii*, n. 126).

## A PROBLEM OF MARITAL OBLIGATIONS

*Question:* Would a husband ever be justified in using a condom when having relations with his wife—namely, if his only purpose is to protect his wife from a disease with which he is afflicted, and there is absolutely no possibility that she will ever again become pregnant? Could he argue in such a case that what he is doing is no sin inasmuch as he is not preventing conception?

*Answer:* The norms of right and wrong in questions concerning marriage and marital relations are based on what is *per se* rather than on what is *per accidens,* on what is the ordinary course of nature rather than on what happens in a particular case contrary to the ordinary course of nature. Accordingly, even though in a particular case a wife is absolutely incapable of becoming pregnant, her husband would not be allowed to have relations with her in a manner which *per se* positively frustrates the marital act of its efficacy toward conception. Even if his only purpose in performing the act in this manner is to protect his wife from disease, he would still commit a grave sin, for a good end does not justify the commission of an intrinsically evil action.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

---

THE CHURCH AND CHRIST

Catholics believe that their Church is directly of divine institution. It is not a system which men, after earnest prayer and thoughtful deliberation, have devised as the best scheme which they could think of for perpetuating the work of their Master Christ. It is truly God's handiwork.

—Msgr. Ronald Knox, in *The Church on Earth* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), p. 11.

# Book Reviews

A Padre Views South America. By Peter Masten Dunne, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1945. Pp. xiii + 290. $2.50.

The author of this book is professor of American History in the University of San Francisco in California. In July, 1943, he undertook a trip through South America for the purpose of study. During that year he visited successively the following countries: Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela. In Brazil, where he spent six weeks, he visited only São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Bahia, Bello Horizonte, and the old Minas Geraes cities of Ouro Preto, Marianna, and Sabará. The incidents and impressions of this trip are narrated in the present book, which appeared in April, 1945. In the course of his narration, presented in the manner of a diary, the author frequently refers to the political, economic, cultural, and religious problems of the countries he visited.

Here we are interested only in the religious aspects as "viewed" by Fr. Dunne. It would be expected that the author would be particularly equipped to understand certain phenomena which characterize the religious situation in Latin America. A careful perusal of the book, particularly of its eleventh and twelfth chapters, however, shows that Fr. Dunne came to South America with preconceived ideas which profoundly influenced his manner of "viewing" and weighing the facts. When he treats of the defects of the religious situation in Latin America, his approach is colored. On the other hand, he never misses an opportunity to refer with sympathy to the Protestants, who, according to him, have "good faith," a "just spirit," and a "fine moral quality" (p. 284). There are contradictory assertions about Catholicity in Brazil. He speaks of its lethargy and lack of vigor (pp. 131, 138), and, at the same time, he praises its activity (p. 135).

It is worthy of note also that the author propounds that intercredal co-operation, against which Dr. Furfey raised his voice (*AER*, CXI, 3 [Sept. 1944], 161-75; and CXII, 5 [May 1945], 375-88). He speaks of "the psychology of compromise" which "is not present in great degree in the Latin temperament" (p. 266). Well and good! With regard to the Protestants, he says that "it might be more constructive to speak oftener of agreements rather than of differences" (p. 98). And he continues: "Protestants are our fellow Christians, our separated brethren. All accept Jesus Christ and most accept the fact of His Divinity. In common we have the bible; in common many of the

fundamental dogmas of Christianity. Many truths Protestantism still holds with the Catholic Church. Some Protestants are fifty per cent Catholic in their doctrine, some seventy-five. Anglicans are ninety per cent and some Anglo-Catholics are doctrinally ninety-nine and one-half per cent Catholic" (pp. 98 f.). On p. 95 he speaks with enthusiasm of "the splendid type of manhood developed in the United States under conditions that are not Catholic," and he says that in his country "Catholic, Protestant, and Jew meet publicly in such organizations as the Conference of Christians and Jews, which has the approval of Catholic bishops." With this mental outlook, it is not to be wondered that the author did not fully appreciate the danger of Protestant proselytism in Latin America.

According to him "the clergy exaggerated the harm being done by this [Protestant] propaganda" (p. 274). He believes that the Protestant activity in Latin America "is not much to be unduly alarmed over" (p. 269). The official protest of the assembled Peruvian bishops against the propaganda of Protestantism apparently has little value; but the reply of a group of assembled Protestants is extensively mentioned. Its tone is called "respectful," and we are told that "in logic it carried weight" (p. 275).

Fr. Dunne's book has evoked protests from two distinguished Jesuits in South America. Fr. Luis Roumanie, S.J., writes in *Serviço Social* (São Paulo, Sept. 1945), p. 183, and speaks very strongly on the subject:

> Fr. Dunne advocated for these fellow-countrymen of his the good neighbor policy, just as it is practiced in the United States. There, it seems, all the creeds live in the most perfect harmony: each pastor takes care of his own flock; no one attempts to disturb his neighbors of other faiths; and they are even able mutually to help one another if the need should arise. Would that the pastors who come to us from North America would bring hither these admirable qualities which distinguish them there! Or, rather, would that those who come here were not of a worse quality, as so often has happened. It is known that in many cases we are treated as a part of darkest Africa: he who does not succeed in the United States because he has not attained the rank of pastor, or who has not the proper character, may go to South America! And hither come the petulant, the aggressive, the ignorant ones. Unloading their trunks of bibles, they begin also to unleash their attacks against the Church. We should, says Fr. Dunne, give credit to their good faith. We shall, when it exists and proves itself.
>
> What kind of good faith is that which rises up in protest when a civil authority, using his right, places the crucifix in a public office? By any chance, does Christ Crucified not count with them? Is He not God? Is He not Saviour of Humanity? And if not, what have they come here to do? Indeed we should treat Protestants, American, English, or those of any

other nationality, with justice and charity. But we shall never open our arms to them and treat them as good neighbors when they are seeking only to undermine the true Christianity of the countries which receive them.

Do they come out of good faith? Do they love Jesus Christ? Then, in our large cities there is no lack of spiritists, Jews, and even Mohammedans for them to convert. There is no lack of unexplored hinterland and people yet pagan to whom they may teach the message of Christ. Let them cease warring insidiously and maliciously against the Church to which almost all South Americans belong; let them work faithfully to call to the fold of Christ the sheep who as yet do not know the voice of the Good Shepherd; and then we can live in peace and good neighborliness with them. But that a pastor of souls, responsible for these souls, should treat as good neighbors these ravening wolves who do everything possible to carry the sheep off and to lead them astray—this cannot be! It is not in accord with the Gospel, nor with the example of the Apostles and the great shepherds of the Church.

Another Jesuit, Fr. Juan Alvarez, of Colombia, published in *Revista Javeriana* (Nov. 1945), pp. 260 ff., an article entitled "Católicos del norte y católicos del sur," which contains a trenchant analysis of Fr. Dunne's viewpoint on the Catholic situation in Latin America. We cite the following passages:

We must at the outset say that there are many substantial points in which we roundly disagree with his manner of viewing these questions of ours. There is a method of approaching them which is too facile, not to say ingenuous. In general, both Fr. Dunne and other specialists on Latin American subjects, despite a certain suavity of expression, reveal an alarming pessimism with respect to our situation . . . In all of Latin America we reject Protestant proselytism, not because it is something from North America, as some think, but because it is a real threat to the unity of faith which we esteem above all else, and which, to our way of thinking, is a question of life and death for our cultural and political being. More, we reject it as an insult to our dignity . . . There cannot be cited one case of civil intolerance in Latin America towards those who profess creeds different from ours; but the new situation provoked by Protestant proseletyzing shows such a lack of shame that, to accept it, we should have to renounce completely that which the human person cannot renounce, *i.e.*, his own dignity. It would be better that North American Catholics who think in this manner keep silence, for they are not doing any good, and are misdirecting public opinion in the United States with an irresponsibility which can only be excused on the plea of misunderstanding and ignorance.

Fortunately, Fr. Dunne's opinion does not seem to prevail among American Catholics. Richard Pattee, in a recent discussion of the book in *The Catholic Historical Review* (April, 1946), praises it, but makes some important reservations. Furthermore, during the past year, on the occasion of a visit to the United States, I had the opportunity to

speak about the affair with many priests who expressed their dissatisfaction with the precipitate and false manner in which *A Padre Views South America* centers attention on certain aspects of the religious situation in Latin America.

THOMAS BORGMEIER, O.F.M.

*Rio de Janeiro*

MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY. By Edgar Schmiedler, O.S.B., Ph.D. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1946. Pp. xii + 285. $1.80.

Father Schmiedler's publication of a text for a course on marriage and the family for use in Catholic schools may well be noted with approval by Catholic educators and sociologists alike. Catholic educators have had it borne in upon them that at the current stage of our American culture, the high school student is far more aware of basic human relationship than his parents were credited with being in their high-school days. The Catholic sociologist is not alone in perceiving the evil effects that have been allowed to build up in an age group woefully under-informed.

A course based on this text will aim to eradicate the evils by giving due and proper information to those who need it most. What Father Schmiedler has to say is framed around the encyclical on *Christian Marriage* of Pius XI. Within that scope the author seeks to reach two aims he has set for himself: first, to give the student directly a certain amount of information and guidance regarding family life; second, to induce him to observe, to think ahead, to study further, and to plan regarding his own future marriage and family life.

Encyclicals, by the very reason of the immense audience to whom they are directed, must be couched in generalities; it is left to competent authorities to interpret and enlarge, each in his own sphere and culture, what the Pontiff has said. In bringing the Encyclical into focus on the American scene, Fr. Schmiedler has not resorted to a dim shadowing of ugly or distasteful areas in order to say he presented a picture of everything to be seen and recognized by Catholic students. What he has to say about disgraceful customs in adolescent and pre-marital associations, about birth control, about mis-handling family funds, he says in forthright terms.

Father Schmiedler does not limit himself to the discussion of personal moral issues; he goes on to investigate the family as the unit of the church and state with a vital interest in the conduct of our school system. He discusses family conflicts and tensions, and the root of family failure. He gives, in short, a complete survey of the field of family life and relations.

Any religious teacher may well sample the ideas of this work simply to have the benefit of its viewpoint and method; the religion teacher who feels impelled by circumstance to give religious instruction by means of little humorous anecdotes and periodic charges through a section of the catechism will find here, at least for marriage and family subjects, meat for a substantial feeding that will provide lasting strength to growing minds.

PATRICK O'BRIEN, C.M.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE GOSPELS. By R. V. G. Tasker. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1944. Pp. x + 137. $1.50.

This little book is based on the author's lectures to students at the University of London, and is intended not for the specialist but for secondary school teachers engaged in teaching Scripture courses on that level. Mr. Tasker evidences a real reverence and devotion to Jesus of Nazareth. He remarks significantly: "The Jesus that must be accepted or rejected by mankind in every age is not the Jesus that can be reconstructed by critics from certain passages in the Gospels (for such a Jesus is, as a rule, scarcely worth accepting or rejecting), but the Jesus of the four Gospels, Who is no less than the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. And any 'Scripture teaching' or 'religious education' which presents Him as anything less than this is scarcely worth the trouble of those who may engage in it."

This is well said, but it seems that Mr. Tasker would accept this Jesus on some kind of blind faith, for he refuses to recognize that the Gospels are altogether and in every respect reliable history. While he admits that "doctrine is not, as some in our day crudely imagine, a later development of Christianity, or an addition to it," at the same time he is willing to admit "embellishments, if not legendary additions" to the Gospel story. Some incidents strongly resemble those recorded in the Apochryphal gospels, and thus become historically suspect. The Gospel according to Luke contains a "strong element of interpretation." Its author is accused of an excessive valuation of ascetism and celibacy due to Pauline influence.

Yet we think that the views of Mr. Tasker are an encouraging sign of the times, pointing to a return to Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. The sooner the world arrives at that view, based not on blind faith but on solid historical evidence, the quicker will be its recovery from the havoc wrought by the recent war.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

MARIOLOGY. By Rev. M. J. Scheeben. Translated by T. L. M. J. Geukers. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. xxxv + 252. $2.50.

There are many reasons for rejoicing over the appearance of this first volume of Fr. Scheeben's *Mariology*. It gives American readers, clerical and lay, an opportunity to come into immediate contact with a great theologian and a great Mariologist. Fr. Scheeben's work is of importance not only doctrinally, but also methodologically.

Fr. Geukers has undertaken to translate those sections of Fr. Scheeben's *Handbook der katholischen Dogmatik* that contain his doctrine on the Mother of God. He has ordered the sections well so that there is no sense of discontinuity in the doctrine of this first volume.

The introductory sections contain a brief but quite adequate treatment of the sources of Mariology in the Scriptures and Tradition. Especially noteworthy is the theological utilization of the Old Testament witness to Mary in the Canticle of Canticles, the Psalms, and the Sapiential Books. The section on Tradition may seem unusually brief, for Fr. Scheeben prefers to reserve specific references to Tradition for the particular treatises of his Mariology.

Almost the whole of this volume is concerned with the divine Maternity of Mary as the source of all her dignity. There is a most acute and exhaustive analysis of the concept of Mary's maternity. There is also the exposition of Fr. Scheeben's chief contribution to Mariology—the bridal relation between Mary and Christ. It is in this principle, *viz.*, that Mary is the Bridal Mother of the Word, that Scheeben finds the unity of his dogmatic treatise on Mary. In the concept of Bridal Motherhood is contained all of Mary's privileges, for she is both the Mother and the Spouse of Christ, intimately linked with her Son right from the first promise of Redemption made by God to Adam and Eve. The first Adam and Eve having failed the human race and plunged their children into the abyss of sin, God held out the hope of a new Adam and a new Eve. As the new Eve, Mary is the spiritual Mother of the sons of God of whom Christ is the Father.

We should like also to call the reader's attention to Fr. Scheeben's treatment of the marriage of Mary and Joseph. He clearly demonstrates its eminent perfection as a real marriage.

Many of Fr. Scheeben's ideas have entered into subsequent treatises on Mary. Some have met with opposition from other theologians, as, for example, his comparison of Mary with the heart of the Mystical Body of Christ. Other theologians prefer to speak of the Holy Ghost as the Heart, overlooking the fact that the Holy Ghost cannot be a *member* of the Body. Fr. Scheeben fruitfully links Mary with the Holy Ghost,

Who is the power by which she performs her functions in the Mystical Body.

Besides bringing Fr. Scheeben's doctrine to a new audience, this translation, let us hope, will impress readers with the method of the great theologian. The original work is a textbook that has little of the appearance of many of our theological manuals. Fr. Scheeben has tremendous skill in combining positive and scholastic theology in such a way as to make them both fruitful. His constant dependence on the texts of Sacred Scripture and the doctrinal statements of Tradition, his scientific and effective utilization of them, his profound analyses of the salient points of a doctrine should serve as a model for theological writing.

The translator has done a difficult task well. Admittedly, he has tried to break up the heavy sentences of the original German and with great success. In one case, it seems, he has failed to convey the meaning accurately. On p. 195, we read: "According to the unanimous teaching of theologians, neither is it possible that this grace could be gained in the proper sense of *de condigno* through supernatural actions, having their root in sanctifying grace; it could be gained in an analogous way as the union with God in glory." That last phrase certainly is open to misinterpretation. We might also question the fitness of translating *aneignen* as "appropriates" (p. 80), because of the theological implications of the term. The human nature of Christ is not the Word's by appropriation.

Finally, we hope that this specimen of Fr. Scheeben's theology will arouse a desire for further translations of the same author.

JAMES M. EGAN, O.P.

THE LIFE OF FATHER FABER. By Rev. James F. Cassidy, B.A. London: Sands and Co., 1946. Pp. 128. $1.75.

In his Preface the author says that it is his purpose to present "a fresh and popular biographical tribute" to Father Frederick Faber. Unfortunately the book does not live up to the expectations this claim arouses. Father Cassidy has been content to limit himself to a hagiographical timetable, which, although it gives us some idea of Father Faber's immense labors, tells us little of the man himself or of his relation to the times in which he lived. The narrative skips from sermon to mission to lecture to book, without pause for analysis of the extraordinary personality behind all this activity. The author's choice of letters and other source material could be improved, one feels, and his sustained tone of praise would be more impressive were it less uncritical.

The past two years have seen considerable interest awakened in the Oxford Movement and the great men it brought into the Church. Father Faber was undoubtedly one of the most interesting and multi-sided of these men. And the present book can be of service as an initial step which may lead to a further and more adequate treatment of the apostolic priest whose story it tells.

TIMOTHY S. HEALY, S.J.

NO DREAMERS WEAK. By Michael de la Bedoyere. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, No Date. Pp. 168. $2.00.

Mr. de la Bedoyere has given this book the subtitle *A Study of Christian Realism as Against Visionary Utopianism in Avoiding Another Great War and Making a Real Peace.* He intends it "as a further exposition of the general point of view expressed in *Christian Crisis* and *Christianity in the Market Place*" (p. 1). Hence, those who are at all familiar with these previous books by Mr. de la Bedoyere will know pretty well what to expect in *No Dreamers Weak.*

The author is certainly to be commended for his zeal in striving to bring Christian principles to bear upon the construction of a worthy and lasting peace. His work, however, is in a great measure frustrated by his habit of flighty generalization, and by his notable want of strict accuracy, especially in speaking of matters theological. Thus, when dealing with the "morals," which together with "faith" constitute the field of the Church's infallibility, Mr. de la Bedoyere makes the observation that "Morals, as I have said, are a matter of natural reason, not of special revelation" (p. 31). Both his antecedent and his consequent are questionable, if only by reason of their ambiguity, in the declaration that "since the Divine revelation and the vision of the human conscience do not extend to a clear sight of right and wrong, good and bad, truth and error in most of our day to day temporal concerns, any attempt on the part of the Church to apply its Divine authority to purely temporal matters would lead to an intolerable tyranny . . ." (p. 35).

Like almost every other literate foreigner, Mr. de la Bedoyere has tried his hand at a description of the American spirit. It appears in this book as the section "A Character Reading of the United States." Yet, despite this section, and despite a tendency to becloud the issue, *No Dreamers Weak* is a stimulating and by no means a worthless book.

Why do some publishers still shy away from the practice of dating their wares?

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

A Companion to the Old Testament. By John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.Scr.L. and Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J., Ph.D. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1946. Pp. vi + 406.

Though the authors themselves nowhere say so explicitly, this work seems to be intended as a guide to the Old Testament for the educated Catholic Layman.

The first chapter contains a brief statement of the matter on General Introduction to the Old Testament as contained in Fr. Steinmueller's *Companion to Scripture Studies.* There follows a chapter on archeological methods and findings. The authors then take up primitive history and the history of the Israelites, with the background for the various stages of that history and an explanation of some of the more outstanding questions of exegesis. There follow chapters on the prophets and the Messianic prophecies, on Hebrew poetry, on the book of Job, and on Wisdom in the Old Testament. A final chapter digests in a few lines the contents of each of the books of the Old Testament. There is then given a list of dates and a bibliography by chapters to which the introduction seems to refer the reader for further information. There are four small and two large maps in colors, but no illustrations at all.

As can easily be seen from this sketch of the contents, this book packs into a little over four hundred pages an immense amount of material. It is not a book to be recommended either to the casual or even the ordinarily serious reader. In places, at least, names and dates and figures tumble out in such profusion that only a close study will lead the reader through with some definite ideas. The occasional Latin quotation or Greek word may annoy one who has no acquaintance with these languages. Even for the English vocabulary, any but a professional student of the Scriptures will do well to keep a dictionary at hand as he reads. Certain exegetical difficulties, the six days of creation, for instance, are solved so succinctly that it will be difficult for one not familiar with the question beforehand to feel that a solution has really been given. It seems that it would have been better in these cases to omit the catalog of interpretations which the authors do not accept (pp. 57-58 give seven solutions to the question of the first chapter of Genesis) and to explain more in detail the one opinion which is proposed as the most acceptable.

The historical matter, which occupies about one-half of the volume, gives a good summary of the history of the Israelites as contained in the Scriptures and, in addition, a close digest of the salient facts of extra-biblical history that throw light on the sacred narrative. One might question the advisability of treating the divided kingdoms together by periods, as the authors have done. In the interest of clarity,

there is much to be said for a separate treatment of the whole history of each kingdom.

The reviewer liked best the chapter, "The Role of the Prophets," in which the authors, after having given a brief explanation of the function of the prophets in the Old Testament, give a digest in logical order of the many Messianic passages of the Old Testament with their verification in the life of Our Lord and of the Church. The chapters on the Sapiential books provide a good introduction to the mechanics and imagery of Hebrew poetry and to the most elevated sections of the Old Testament with which our Catholics might well be familiarized.

The bibliography and the footnotes refer the reader to many scholarly books and periodicals to which the reader probably has no access and which he would not read even if he had.

For religion courses at the college level, a professor skilled in Old Testament studies will find in this volume much matter of instruction and discussion; a well-educated layman will find some of the chapters very useful in introducing him to new fields of study of God's revelation and economy of redemption.

D. W. MARTIN, C.M.

---

THE CHURCH AND THE COUNCILS

After the close of the Council of Trent, the separations which were foreseen became complete. Whole kingdoms fell from the unity of the faith. But from that hour the Council of Trent has renewed and governed the Catholic Church. It may be said with truth that as the Council of Nicaea has guarded the faith of the Holy Trinity to this hour, so the Council of Trent has guarded both the doctrines assailed in the sixteenth century, and the discipline of the Church in its manifold contacts with the world. The Church has been reproached as Tridentine. No greater honour could be paid to the Council of Trent. The Church is Tridentine in the sense in which it is Nicene, and in which it will henceforth bear the stamp of the Vatican Council. Every Oecumenical Council leaves its impress upon it, and all these impressions are clear and harmonious. The Church is not like a *Codex rescriptus* in which the later writings obliterate or confuse the former, but like the exquisite operations of art in which the manifold lines and colours and tints are laid on in succession, each filling up what the other begins, and combining all into one perfect whole.

—Cardinal Manning in *The True Story of the Vatican Council* (London, 1877), pp. 202 f.